







VINDICATION

OF

CERTAIN PASSAGES

IN THE

FOURTH AND FIFTH VOLUMES

OF THE

HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

BY J. LINGARD, D.D.

“Voilà la cause de la mort de M. l'Admiral et du massacre des siens, encore
 “qu'il y en ait plusieurs, qu'on ne leur sçauroit oster l'opinion de la teste que cette
 “fusée n'eust esté filée de longue main, et cette trame couvée. *Ce sont abus.*”

BRANTOME, li. 282.

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON :

PRINTED FOR J. MAWMAN, 39, LUDGATE STREET.

1826.

LONDON:

SHACKEL AND CO. JOHNSON'S-COURT, FLEET-STREET.

INTRODUCTION.

It did not escape me, when I first sate down to write the “ History of England,” that I had imposed on myself a toilsome and invidious task. I foresaw that it would require habits of patient research, and incessant application; that I should frequently be obliged to contradict the statements of favourite writers, occasionally perhaps to offend the political or religious partialities of my readers; and that my pretensions to accuracy would provoke others to seek out and expose those casual errors, which no human vigilance can totally exclude from long and laborious compositions. But the knowledge of these inconveniences did not divert me from my purpose. I have pursued it faithfully and fearlessly through six quarto volumes, and have brought down the history

from the first invasion by the Romans to the death of Charles the First.

As the work issued from the press, it gradually attracted notice. By some writers it was honoured with the meed of their approbation : others selected certain portions for the subject of animadversion. To these I made no reply, intending to reserve myself till the completion of my labours, and then, in a general answer, to admit emendation, where I found myself in error, and to defend my former statements, where I thought them captiously or wantonly assailed. If I now recede from that resolution, it is in consequence of a late article in the “*Edinburgh Review*.” Its writer, having previously surveyed the whole work, pounces, with the rapacity of the vulture, on a note at the end of the fifth volume, relating to an event unconnected with English history ; and encouraged by the detection of certain real or imaginary errors, he charges me with carelessness, and fraud, and misrepresentation, and pronounces his solemn and deliberate judgment, that the book “is one of a most dangerous description, which will impress the minds of its readers with false and incorrect notions of the history of their country, and of the character and conduct of their ancestors.” This sample of enlightened criticism has drawn from me the

present tract. It is not in my disposition to affect an apathy which I do not feel, or to sit down tamely under reproach, which I do not deserve. I owe it to myself to refute this sweeping accusation ; I owe it to my readers to show, that I have not abused their confidence.

With the Scottish reviewer I shall also notice two other opponents ; the Reverend Mr. Todd, who conceives that I have not done justice to the memory of archbishop Cranmer, and a writer in the “ Quarterly Review,” whose gallantry has induced him to advocate the cause of the unfortunate Anne Boleyn. The objections of these three, with my answers to each, will occupy the following pages. If there be little in the controversy to interest the curiosity of the reader, I shall not at least exhaust his patience by treating any subject at greater length than its importance may require.

Figure 1. The effect of the concentration of the *Agrobacterium* suspension on the transformation efficiency of *Agrobacterium* strains.

1

[Faint, illegible text from the reverse side of the page]

[Faint, illegible text]

Figure 1. The effect of the concentration of the *Agrobacterium* suspension on the transformation efficiency of *Agrobacterium* strains.

... ..

THE EDINBURGH REVIEW.

CHAPTER I.

My Memoir on the Parisian Massacre—Judgment of the Reviewer—His artful manner of Proof—Improbability of a preconcerted Plot—The King's friendship for the Admiral—The attempt on the Admiral's Life—The visit of Charles after the attempt—The absence of contemporary and credible authority—The testimony of the Duke of Anjou and Tavannes—The proceedings immediately before the Massacre—The credulity of the Reviewer—The King's despatches to the Provinces—The number of the slain.

THERE is something extraordinary in the choice made by the reviewer. To judge of a history of England, he has selected a subject exclusively French; and to enable his readers to form an opinion of the whole work, he has called their attention to the contents of a single note. There is something still more extraordinary in the manner, in which he has executed his task. He can see nothing to commend: even the old maxim of “damning with faint praise” is forgotten: in every page, in almost every line, he discovers, or pretends to discover, instances of error, or ignorance, or misrepresentation. Nor is he content with impeaching the literary, he also assails the moral, character of the writer. He represents him as guilty of intentional fraud, as actuated by religious animosities, and as taking advantage of the ignorance of the public, to mislead and deceive the reader. Such conduct, however, though it be varnished over with a display of

authorities and quotations, is not calculated to win credit with the discerning reader. Of its cause he may be ignorant: but he will not fail to remark, that, let it proceed whence it may, it has more the appearance of personal pique than of impartial criticism.

Reviewers should always bear in mind, that it is a dangerous experiment to sport with the public credulity. They hold office *durante bene placito*: As long as they fairly exhibit the merits and demerits of the writers, whom they call before their tribunal, they may be assured of support. But if they allow prejudice to guide their pens, if they make their pages subservient to private antipathies and resentments, if, under the pretence of diffusing information, they chiefly seek to injure the character of a supposed adversary;¹ they violate the first of their duties, they break their word to their readers, and they infallibly forfeit, as they deserve to forfeit, the confidence of the public.

It has pleased the reviewer to constitute himself my accuser: it remains for me to repel the accusation. If I fail in the attempt, the failure will justify his conduct: if I succeed, and of success I cannot entertain a doubt, *his* will be the disgrace of defeat, and the shame of misrepresentation. He has provoked the contest: he must submit to the consequences.

In my history of the reign of Elizabeth, I was led to notice, at some length, the Parisian massacre in 1572, not so much because it belonged to the subject, as that I might conform to the practice of

¹ The article in the review was provoked by a letter in a newspaper, which was so worded, as to have the appearance of coming from me. I, therefore, take this opportunity of saying, that I was not privy either to the writing or the publication of that letter.

preceding writers. But at the same time I ventured to depart from the common opinion, that it was the effect of a preconcerted plot, and to consider it as the sudden result of an accidental and unforeseen event. I was, indeed, aware, as old Mathieu had taught me in his narrative of the same transaction, that it is not always prudent to advocate the cause of truth in opposition to accredited error :² and I readily foresaw that the statement which I should make, would excite surprise, and provoke contradiction. But the fact appeared to me a proper subject for historical inquiry ; and the consideration that two centuries and a half have elapsed since it happened, that time has been allowed for passion to cool, and prejudice to wear away, determined me to commit my opinion fairly and fearlessly to the candour and discernment of my readers.

Judgment of the Reviewer. It was, however, unfortunate that my memoir could not appear in its original shape. It had been reserved for a place among the notes in the appendix to the fifth volume : and the overgrown bulk of that volume compelled me to reduce it to one half of its original size. In consequence I confined myself to a rapid, and, in some points perhaps unsatisfactory, narrative. Minor, though corroborative, circumstances, were omitted ; many of the particular authorities were suppressed ; and all reasoning on either side of the question was excluded. On this account it was, that in a short prefatory address, I requested the reader to believe

² Je sçais bien qu'il y a de l'imprudence à penser persuader des choses vraies contre l'erreur commune et la creance publique : et néanmoins plusieurs ont oui dire à Villeroy que cette journée ne fût pas premeditée, come on le rapporte. Hist. de Charl. ix. i. 343.

that my opinion, differing as it did from that of many other writers, "was not formed till after a diligent perusal and comparison of the most authentic documents on the subject."³

Whatever others may have thought of this passage, the reviewer openly comes forward to declare that he does not credit my assertion. The memoir, he contends, exhibits so many instances of carelessness and haste, so many misconceptions and misrepresentations, so long a train of literary delinquencies, that he cannot believe I have read with attention, if I have read at all, the works to which I appeal. On the contrary, he suspects that all the knowledge which I possess of the St. Bartholomew, is derived from Caveyrac, and that it is through the medium of that writer, that I have seen and "diligently compared the original documents on this subject."⁴

His artful manner of proof. 1. It were to be wished that critics would quote fairly, when they mean to condemn severely. In this passage, and in the two following pages, the reviewer professes thrice to quote my very words, and thrice substitutes in their place words of his own.⁵ I said, that I had compared "the most authentic documents;" he makes me say that I compared the "original documents." The change may be unintentional, but it is not immaterial. By "the most authentic documents," I meant documents of sufficient authority to deserve credit, as coming from men, who either were the original devisers, or received their infor-

³ Hist. viii. 515. I quote the 8vo edition that I may not differ from the reviewer.

⁴ Rev. 95.

⁵ Rev. p. 95. 97.

mation from the original devisers, of the massacre. Such persons may be admitted as authentic witnesses. But the "original documents" of the reviewer are not confined to such evidence: he extends the denomination to the numerous writings on the subject, published within a few years after the event;⁶ of which the far greater part proceeded from those, who possessed not the means of ascertaining the real origin of the tragedy, and who wrote only from hearsay, conjecture, and passion. Such writings cannot be classed among "the most authentic documents on the subject:" so that, should the reviewer prove that I have neglected to consult some of *them*, he still will not have proved any thing contradictory of my assertion.

2. It is, moreover, both singular and suspicious, that from the prefatory address, he should immediately hurry away to the very last paragraph in the memoir. There he discovers a passage, in which by mistake the epithet "huguenot" has been prefixed to a list of six writers: and very plausibly

⁶ See Rev. p. 97. He mentions particularly Masson's life of Charles IX. published by Le Laboureur, Castelnau, iii. 15. and as he frequently refers to this tract, I may be allowed to inform the reader, that Masson's *Vita Caroli IX.* consists of six loosely printed pages, in which the immense number of fifteen lines is devoted to the history of the St. Bartholomew. It abounds with errors, and is rather a sketch containing the heads of a projected history, than a history itself: it was written by Masson just after the death of Charles, and then thrown aside. Of his motives we know nothing; but though he lived five and thirty years afterwards, though in that interval he published his annals and other works, he never thought proper to send the *Vita Caroli* to the press. Yet this is one of "the original, or authentic documents," which, according to the reviewer, I ought to have consulted!

infers that, since three of the six, Perefice, De Thou, and Masson, are known to have been catholics, Dr. Lingard could not have been conversant with their works. But may I ask, why the reviewer has taken this subject from its proper place to introduce it here? Is it not to create a persuasion, that it serves to prove the charge immediately preceding; to shew that I have quoted authorities which I had not consulted? If so, he knows that he is playing a false game. Not one of the three writers is quoted by me throughout the memoir; nor can any of their works be ranked among the authentic documents, which I asserted that I had compared. The fact is, that the passage, in which their names occur, was translated from a French writer, to whom, as to my only authority, I referred the reader.⁷

3. In the next place, I must be allowed to doubt; whether the reviewer believes, as he pretends, that I was ignorant of the religion of the three writers. Masson, indeed, is now an obscure name; and there was a Masson, a calvinist writer in Holland. With respect to him, therefore, I might have been in error. But could he imagine that I had never heard of De

⁷ From Caveyrac, dissertation xxxvi—xli. The reviewer tells us that "this work had little success when it first appeared, and obtained no favourable reputation for its author," p. 95. I know not whence he received his information; but the clamour which it raised among the infidel party in France, and their attempt to put it down, by falsely representing it as an apology of the massacre, are powerful testimonies in its favour. The reviewer lends a helping hand to its opponents, by charging Caveyrac with the omission of two words (*qu' autres,*) in a quotation from *La Popelinière*: I desired a friend to copy for me the whole page from the original, and in his copy the very same words are wanting.

Thou and Perefixe, names so illustrious in the literary and ecclesiastical history of France ; or that I did not know that the president à Mortier always professed himself a catholic, or that the archbishop of Paris could not be a huguenot ? A fair and candid critic would rather have inferred that the word “ huguenot ” had by some accident crept into the text. And so it was. It had been placed by me in the margin as a private mark, a sort of catch-word, to aid my memory, and was taken thence by the copyist or the printer, as a correction for the word “ national,” the true reading in the manuscript. With this, indeed, the reviewer could not be acquainted. But when he considered that it was but the error of a single word, he ought to have hesitated before he charged to ignorance and imposture, what might have been, as in reality it was, the effect of mere accident. If he have written much for the press, he must know that such errors are not uncommon.* He must occasionally have discovered in his manuscript a word which he never intended to write, and in the printed copy a word which he had never written. The operations of the mind outstrip in speed those of the body. While the hand is employed in tracing the characters on paper, or in arranging the types against the rule, the mind frequently hurries forward, and a word, connected with the new train of thought, is introduced by

* Not uncommon even in the writings of the reviewer himself. Thus I have shewn that in transcribing my words he has thrice substituted “ original ” for “ authentic ; ” and thus again in p. 123, he refers to La Popelinière, ii. 67. for the massacre of Vassy, though in reality it is my reference for the massacre of Paris, which happened ten years afterwards.

manual operation, without the consciousness of the writer or of the compositor. To this or some similar cause the suspicious appearance of the word "huguenot" might have been attributed. But to the reviewer it seemed otherwise. He had detected the error, and resolved to derive from it every advantage in his power. The merit of the discovery he may claim: but I doubt whether that merit will atone, in the estimation of the reader, for the unfair use to which it has been applied.

A preconcerted Plot improbable. We may now return to the memoir, the first half of which is occupied by a hasty sketch of the principal events that preceded the massacre. To this part the reviewer has offered no objection. I shall, however, recal its contents to the attention of my readers: because, 1. the friendship of the king for Coligni, the leader of the huguenots; 2. the attempt on the life of that nobleman; 3. and the visit of the royal family to the bed-side of the wounded man, are facts which forcibly demonstrate the utter improbability of the opinion so confidently maintained by my adversary.

The King's Friendship for the Admiral. In the first place, I noticed the friendship which the king, Charles IX., after the pacification of 1570, manifested for the admiral, and the ascendancy which that friendship gave him over the mind of the young monarch. His correspondence with the king was frequent, his interviews were secret and confidential. To attach Charles to his party, he is said, to have awakened the royal jealousy by throwing out suspicions of the designs of the queen mother, who monopolized the powers of government, and was

careful to bring forward on all occasions her favourite son, the duke of Anjou:⁹ and with the same view he flattered the king's ambition, by proposing to him the conquest of the Netherlands as an easy achievement, if he would permit the French protestants to aid their brethren, the Gueux of Flanders, already in arms against the king of Spain. In the year 1571, he visited Charles, both at Blois and at Paris: in 1572 he was invited to assist at the marriage of the king of Navarre. The ceremony had been fixed for the 18th of August: but he repaired to the court in June, partly at the solicitation of the English ambassador, partly through his own anxiety to further the Spanish war.¹⁰ There he remained during two months, making or appearing to make daily advances in the royal confidence, and exciting the most serious apprehensions in the breasts of the opposite party. Now the writers, who believe in a preconcerted plot, are compelled to maintain that all this while Charles was acting the part devised for him by the queen mother, feigning a friendship which he did not feel, and seeking by smiles and courtesies to allure the admiral and his friends to the spot designed for their destruction. But, 1. at the commencement of this period, he was only twenty years old. Is it probable that so young a prince should be so consummate a master in the art of dissimulation, as to be able for two years to carry on this system without detection; a prince, too, who from the sudden bursts of passion to which

⁹ Mémoires de Villeroy, ii. 63. Mémoires de l'Etoile, i. 47. Le-Laboureur, Castlenau, iii. 31.

¹⁰ Mémoires de l'estat de France, sous Charles Neufiesme, i. 72. 85. 217. Meidelboug, 1578.

he was subject, was liable at any moment to betray his real sentiments? 2. Is it credible that the admiral, a wary and veteran politician, would suffer himself, for so long a period, to be duped by the mere acting of a raw and unexperienced youth, and so completely duped, that even the attempt on his life did not dispel the delusion?¹¹ 3. Is it possible that if Charles dissembled, his brother of Anjou and the marshal de Tavannes, his supposed accomplices in the plot, should be unacquainted with his dissimulation? Yet that they were, is evident from this fact, that they presented four memorials which are still extant, to the council, to dissuade the king from the Spanish war, to which he was led by the advice of the admiral.¹²

These are improbabilities which it will require no little ingenuity to remove: there are others still more appalling to succeed.

The attempt on the Admiral's life. In the next place, I related the attempt to murder the admiral in the open street on the 22d of August. He was wounded, but not mortally, and the assassin who escaped, is known to have been employed by the queen mother, the duke of Anjou, and their confi-

¹¹ If we may believe Margaret, the sister of Charles, the dissimulation was on the other side. Les renards avoient sceu si bien feindre, qu'ils avoient gagné le cœur de ce brave prince, pour l'esperance de se rendre utiles à l'acroissement de son estat, et en luy proposant de belles et glorieuses enterprises en Flandres. Mémoires de Marguerite de Valois, lii. 174. I quote from the collection universelle des mémoires particuliers relatifs à l'histoire de France, by Perrin, 1785—1791.

¹² They are to be found in the Mémoires de Tavannes, Tom. xxvii. 225. 229. 248. 292.

dential advisers, the very persons to whom the design of a general massacre is attributed by the reviewer. But by what ingenuity can this event be reconciled with such a design? What possible motive could there be to attempt the life of one man, if the object was to take the lives of all? Its effect must have been to awaken the suspicion of the intended victims, to warn them of their danger, to suggest to them projects of resistance or escape. That the life of the admiral alone was sought, is most certain. Every precaution had been taken to secure the flight of the assassin, but no preparations had been made to follow up the blow. If the admiral had fallen, his adherents would probably have withdrawn to places of safety. They might have done it on that day; they might have done it on the next. The proposal was twice made, but rejected by the obstinacy of the leaders.¹³ Whoever considers these circumstances, must, I think, conclude that no general massacre was at that time in contemplation.

The King's visit to the Admiral. Lastly, I related the impression which this attempt appeared to make on the mind of the king. He expressed the most lively apprehension for the fate of his wounded friend, and gave peremptory orders for the discovery and punishment of the assassin and his employers. Not content with this, he visited the admiral in his bed, accompanied by the queen, his two brothers, and his principal counsellors.

¹³ Mémoires de l'estat. i. 282. Popelinière, ii. 64. Si deslors ils eussent deslogé de Paris et gaigné Orleans, le surplus ne fust arrivé, et n'eust on ozé rien faire à M. l'Admiral. Mémoires de Jean de Mergez, xli. 86.

Now this visit opposes another most powerful objection to the hypothesis of a preconcerted plot. There was no necessity that Charles should visit the admiral, merely because that nobleman desired it: on the contrary, the very request was likely to excite apprehension in a guilty mind. Yet he goes there without guards: he puts himself, his mother, and brothers into the power of the men, whose destruction he is supposed to have been plotting for two years, and whose suspicions he must have expected to be raised by the late attempt: and he puts himself into their power at a moment, when they are assembled at the house to the number of two hundred, with arms in their hands, and cries of vengeance in their mouths. To me it is utterly incredible that, with the consciousness of guilt on his mind, he should have thus unnecessarily exposed himself, and those who were most dear to him, to such imminent danger.

And here there occurs an additional difficulty. Why did Catharine, the real contriver of the murderous attempt, accompany the king to the admiral's chamber? The writers of both parties agree that she feared the influence of Coligni over her son, and sought to prevent by her presence the introduction of any subject prejudicial to her interests. The protestants relate that the wounded chieftain was not to be deterred; that he reminded Charles of the many warnings which he had previously given him, and that he had begun to point the suspicions of the king against certain persons, who were undermining his throne, when Catharine suddenly interposed, and put an end to the conversation.¹⁴ The account

¹⁴ Mais la Royne mere scait fort bien empescher, qu'il ne commu-

of the duke of Anjou is more particular, though rather different. According to him, Charles, at the request of the admiral, ordered his mother and brother to withdraw to the centre of the room. They obeyed: but the earnestness with which the admiral was observed to speak, excited the alarm of Catharine. She interrupted his discourse; prevailed on her son to depart, and employed all her arts to draw from him the secret subject of the conversation. At last he exclaimed with an oath: "what the admiral said was the truth; I have allowed the sovereign authority to slip from my hands into yours and those of my brother: it is necessary that I be upon my guard against a power which will soon overbalance my own. This was what he told me, and begged me to receive, as the death-bed advice of a loyal and devoted servant."¹⁵ It is immaterial which of these narratives we prefer. Each of them shows that Catharine was, and had reason to be, jealous of the influence of the admiral with the king: a jealousy, which it will be difficult to account for, if we believe that he had been employed for two years in endeavours, under her direction, to allure that nobleman and his adherents to their destruction.

No credible authority for a preconcerted Plot. 1. When I sate down to compose the memoir, I entertained no doubt of the received opinion, that the massacre was the effect of a preconcerted plot: but

nique particulièrement au Roy quelques secrets touchant la conservation de son estat. De Serres. iii. 177. Mémoires de l'estat. i. 278. Thuan. iii. 124.

¹⁵ Mémoires de Villeroy, ii. 67-69.

these formidable objections induced me to pause, and to inquire on what real foundation a system so replete with improbabilities, was built. Writers, who asserted it, were to be found without number ; they were catholics as well as protestants : some took it for granted ; others attempted to prove it. But what was their authority ? Nothing beyond suspicion, and report, and conjecture. Not one of them, as far as I could discover, pretended to have been privy to the design ; not one received his information from those who were supposed to have been privy to it. All the evidence of this description is on the other side : every credible document, purporting to give the testimony of the king, or of the queen, or of the duke of Anjou, or of their ministers, declares that the massacre was a sudden and unforeseen expedient, suggested by the alarm which the failure of the attempt on the admiral had excited, and by the danger to be expected from the revenge of his adherents.¹⁶

2. It was this which caused me to remark in a note, that the hypothesis of my opponents was “ unsupported by contemporary authority ; ”¹⁷ an

¹⁶ Or il est certain que, si l'amiral fut mort de ses blessures, le malheur de son party s'en fut allé avec lui ; mais quand on assura le roi, qu'il serait bientôt guéri, et sans doute il s'en vengeroit, le roi fut conseillé de le faire achever, et cela ne se pouvant faire sans envelopper en la même peine les principaux de son parti, on jugea nécessaire d'en ruiner plusieurs pour en perdre un. Mathieu, Histoire de Charles ix. i. 344. J'ai écrit plus au long, et, je crois, plus véritablement que nul autre, ce qui se passa en cette journée, parce que je l'ai appris de ceux mêmes qui furent au conseil et à l'exécution.—Id. p. 347.

¹⁷ Hist. vi. 519.

observation which has aroused the astonishment and ire of the reviewer. "Unsupported by contemporary authority!" he exclaims, "why; it was maintained by Capilupi at Rome in the month of September, it was believed by the elector of Saxony in October, it was asserted by an orator in the assembly of the huguenots of Dauphiné in December, and it was assumed as true by the ex-jesuit Masson in 1575."¹⁸ All this I am ready to grant, and even more. But from what source did these persons derive their knowledge? As well might you appeal to the French orators and writers of pamphlets, for contemporary authority to prove that the attempt to destroy the first consul by the explosion of the "infernal machine," in the year 1800, originated with Mr. Windham and his colleagues in the British ministry. A broad distinction should be drawn between authority for a public fact, and authority for a secret design. The fact is a matter of notoriety: its truth may be easily

¹⁸ Rev. 98. 99. "On voit naitre," says D'Aubigné, ii. 70. anno 1618, "un livre, duquel l'auteur s'appelloit *preneur de loups*, pour louer l'excessive finesse, disposition et fermeté de cœur du Roi et de la Reine." The opinion of this wolf-catcher (Capilupi) was, that a league had been concluded between the pope and the two kings of France and Spain, by which the king of France was to massacre all the chiefs of the huguenots at the marriage of his sister, and aid with all his power the duke of Alva to exterminate the rebels in Flanders; the king of Spain was to restore Navarre to the king of France, and aid *the duke of Anjou to get possession of the English crown*; and then the allies were to unite their forces to exterminate the heretics of Germany, and establish a new constitution of the empire by the authority of the pope. Lo Stratagema. 1572. This specimen will teach the reader what judgment he ought to form of the "wolf catcher."

ascertained. I would admit even Capilupi and the elector of Saxony as authority for the fact of the massacre. But a design, supposed to have been formed and conducted in privacy and concealment, unless it be necessarily implied in the result, requires very different proof. Its existence can be shewn only by the confession of the parties, or by the testimony of those, who have derived their knowledge from those parties. Such confession or testimony would be authority, and contemporary authority. But does any such exist? Was any such ever known to exist? No: my opponent "has not the hardihood" to assert it. Where then is his contemporary authority?

Objection to the testimony of Anjou. The reviewer offers two objections to other parts of the same note. 1. I had appealed to the narrative of the duke of Anjou, which, I say, was dictated by him "during a restless night, when his conscience was harassed by the recollection of the massacre," and which has the appearance of coming from one, "who seeks not to excuse but to accuse himself."¹⁹ He tells us that indeed the duke dictated it when "he was agitated by the recollection of the bloody scenes," but that he "expressed in it no contrition for his crime, nor seemed at all conscious of its enormity:" that, on the contrary, he was accustomed "not only to make no secret of his participation in the St.

¹⁹ Hist. viii. 519. That this representation is correct, appears plain to me from the very first words of the narrative. "Je vous fais venir icy, pour vous faire part de mes inquietudes et agitations de cette nuit, qui ont troublé mon repos en pensant à l'exécution de la St. Barthelemy." Mém. de Villeroy, ii. 62.

Bartholomew, but reckoned it among the glorious acts of his life.”²⁰ The difference between us on this subject is not a point worth the mootng. If I am correct, the duke’s narrative deserves credit: if the reviewer be correct, it is equally deserving of credit. For surely we cannot imagine that Anjon would seek to extenuate his participation in that, “which he reckoned among the glorious acts of his life.”

2. *Objection to the testimony of Tavannes.* I added that I had taken a few additional circumstances from the memoirs of Tavannes, who was in the Louvre, and one of the devisers of the massacre. On this the reviewer remarks that, “if Dr. Lingard had in reality read the book, he must have known that it was composed not by the marshal himself, but by his son John, viscount de Tavannes.”—That the memoirs were composed by the viscount for the instruction of his family, I know: but I conceive that there is to be found in them that, which may fairly be taken for the testimony of the marshal himself, transmitted to us through his son. When the viscount comes to the summer of 1572, he gives us several papers, certainly written by his father, and details several particulars which he could hardly have derived from any other source. The reviewer, indeed, tells us “that he was too young to be admitted into the private councils where the massacre was devised,” (which is probably true;) and that “he had too severe a father to venture on questioning him, or attempting to penetrate into his secrets;” which is very ingeniously put forward, not

because it is true, but because it may serve to parry my argument. In defiance, however, of the reviewer, the viscount tells us, that he did procure information from his father. The greater part of the marshal's political life passed before the birth, or during the infancy and boyhood, of the son: but there was one part of the facts which the viscount relates, of which he was the eye witness, and of which he derived the knowledge from his father. "J'ai vu, j'ai sceu partie des faits de M. de Tavannes, mon pere."²¹ Now it so happens, that this part is that which comprehends the massacre. He was then attending his father at court: he was soliciting from the king an appointment to one of the offices held by the marshal; and he was actually employed in the Louvre on the very night of the massacre. All this I did not think it necessary to explain to my readers, particularly as my limits were so confined; and I have yet to learn, that my silence was any fraud on their credulity. But, adds the reviewer, "the father survived the massacre only eleven months, and the son, who was only eighteen years of age, passed a great part of the interval in Rochelle, at a distance from him, and did not finish the miscellaneous composition called the *mémoires de Tavannes*, till fifty years afterwards." At what period he finished the memoirs, or whether he did not write them long before he made the last corrections, is of little consequence. If the reviewer means to assert that the viscount had few opportunities of consulting his father after the massacre, be it so: I shall not contradict him:

²¹ *Mém. de Tavannes*, xxvi. *Epit. dedicat.* p. xxxi.

but if he intend to insinuate that he had no opportunity during the period of the massacre, I shall answer that such insinuation is opposed by the very declaration of the writer, and by the several passages, in which he details his own proceedings on that night of bloodshed and horror.²²

Council before the Massacre. The next paragraph in the memoir describes briefly the council that was held preparatory to the massacre. Had my limits allowed it, I should have premised that the king, on his return from the admiral, sent despatches to every part of the kingdom, announcing the attempt on that nobleman's life, and promising prompt and ample justice on the offenders; that the next morning witnesses were examined before the privy council; that according to report, the horse on which the assassin escaped, was furnished by a servant of the house of Guise, but the arquebuse, which he left behind him, belonged to the guards of the duke of Anjou; that the huguenots paraded in arms before the hotel of Guise; that they threw out insinuations against the queen-mother and her favourite son; that Piles and Pardaillan did all but charge her with the crime to her face; and that the whole party had resolved to demand in a body, justice of the king the next morning.²³ Under these cir-

²² Je sauvay Neuville, Bethunes, Baignac, et ayday fort à la Verdin. Mém. de Tavannes, xxvii. 271. Le Roy de Navarre et prince de Condé craitifs, après avoir essayé de parler à moi, qui ne leur osay respondere. Ibid. 272. Je vis partie des papiers de l'admiral chez mon pere, le roole de leurs hommes, leurs levées de deniers. Ibid. 276.

²³ Mémoires de l'estat, i. 280. 283. Mémoires de Marguerite de Valois, Reine de France et de Navarre, tom. 52. p. 173. 175. 180. 181. Mémoires de Tavannes, tom. 27. p. 265. 266. 269. 270.

cumstances, agitated with the consciousness of guilt, and fearful of its consequences, Catharine assembled the secret council of her adherents, in which the massacre was resolved, as the only means of preventing vengeance, and the renewal of the war.²⁴

Objections of the Reviewer. 1. But here the reviewer charges me with some secret and dishonest design, because, in mentioning the hour at which Charles gave his consent, I desert my former guide the duke of Anjou, and follow the account of his sister, the queen Margaret.—It has, however, always been considered the duty of historians, when the relations, though they agree in substance, disagree in minor circumstances, to prefer that which they think the most probable. It is true that Anjou says of the king, after he had given his consent, “il nous laissa dans son cabinet, ou nous avisames le reste du jour, le soir, et une bonne partie de la nuit.” But I knew that royal authors sometimes express themselves loosely, and that this very passage ought not to be understood strictly according to the letter. For neither he himself, nor his mother remained all that time in the cabinet. To avoid suspicion, about four in the afternoon, he drove with the chevalier d’Angoulême through the streets of Paris,²⁵ and the queen-mother shewed herself publicly at the usual

²⁴ Le péril present, la Reyne en diverses craintes, la verification du coup, que l’on doubtoit s’esclaircir, la guerre ou l’exécution presente pour l’empescher luy tournent dans la teste. Si elle se fust peu parer de la source de l’arquebusade, malaisément eut elle achevé ce à quoy l’évenement la contrainct; l’accident de la blessure au lieu de mort, les menaces forcent le conseil à la résolution de tuer tous les chefs. Tavannes, 267.

²⁵ Mémoires de l’estat, i. 283.

hours in the court.²⁶ For this reason I preferred, though with some hesitation, the account of Margaret, who says expressly that it was about nine or ten at night that the matter was broken to the king by the marshal de Retz, and that at his persuasion Charles joined the council. However, I acknowledge that there is much difficulty in reconciling the different narrations as to the time, and will not dispute, if any one prefer the earlier hour. It is a question of no moment: that, for which I contend is, that the king did not assist at the council for the purpose of deliberating on the execution of a plot, which he had been preparing for the two preceding

²⁶ At her "souper et coucher." *Mémoires de Marguerite*, 175. 179. As this princess was but just married to the king of Navarre, whose youth alone prevented him from being the head of the party, she was kept in ignorance of their design, though it had been communicated to her sister, the duchess of Lorraine. This occasioned the following interesting occurrence at the "coucher" of the queen-mother. *Estant au coucher de la reine ma mere, assise sur un coffre auprès de ma sœur de Lorraine, que je voyois fort triste, la reine ma mere parlant à quelques-uns, m'apperceust, et me dit que je m'en alasse coucher. Comme je faisois la reverence, ma sœur me prend par le bras, et m'arreste, et se prenant fort à pleurer, me dit: mon dieu, ma sœur, n'y allez pas. Ce qui m'effraya extrêmement. La Reine ma mere s'en apperceust, et appellant ma sœur se courrouça fort à elle, et luy defendit de me rien dire. Ma sœur luy dit, qu'il n'y avoit point d'apparence de m'envoyer sacrifier comme cela, et que sans doute s'ils découvroient quelque chose, ils se vengeroient de moy. La Reine ma mere répond, que, s'il plaisoit à dieu, je n'aurois point de mal: mais quoy que ce fut, il falloit que j'allasse, de peur de leur faire soupçonner quelque chose. Je voyois bien qu'ils se contestoient, et n'entendoient (n'entendois) pas leurs paroles. Elle me commanda encore rudement que je m'en alasse coucher. Ma sœur fondant en larmes me dit bon soir, sans m'oser dire autre chose; et moy je m'en allay toute transie et éperdue sans me pouvoir imaginer ce que j'avois à craindre. *Mémoires*, p. 179. 180.*

years, but was led to it, that he might be prevailed upon to consent to a measure, which was suddenly proposed to him, and which in his own mind he disapproved. Of this we are assured by the duke of Anjou from his own knowledge, by Margaret from the express declaration of Charles.²⁷

2. The reviewer maintains that "instead of passing two hours at an open balcony gazing at the stars (as Dr. Lingard pretends) the queen and her sons had two hours sleep before break of day, when they went to the balcony to *enjoy* the commencement of the massacre."²⁸ Bland and balmy sleep no doubt to persons in the expectation of such enjoyment! But I have yet to learn that "*après avoir reposé seulement deux heures,*" necessarily implies actual sleep for that period; and I am sure, that I never thought of placing the royal party for two hours at a balcony gazing at the stars. If any one have so misunderstood me, the cause must be, that seeking to be concise, I have rendered my meaning obscure.²⁹

The Massacre. To explain to my readers the real origin of the plot, was the principal object of the memoir: and, having accomplished that, I passed rapidly over the particulars of the massacre. The cavils of the reviewer, as they contradict not the substance of my statement, can have but little claim to attention: but I must be allowed to notice

²⁷ Mémoires, p. 173. Mém. de Villeroy, ii. 72. ²⁸ Rev. 102.

²⁹ I should observe, that where I am made to say that the king went to the balcony with his mother and brothers, the *s* in the last word is an error of the press. The reviewer might have observed that I have no where so much as hinted that the duke of Alençon had any share in the transaction.

his ingenious insinuation, that under an &c. I endeavoured to conceal what I dared not transcribe : whereas he was perfectly aware that the words omitted were such, that the text itself would naturally suggest their meaning to the reader : “ de prendre armes ny prisonniers sans son congé.” If there were any thing mysterious in these words, why did he not quote them ? Or why did he tell his readers to judge what was concealed under them from a passage which he did quote, but which was taken from a different place, and was part of the king’s answer to a question put to him in parliament by Pibrac, the attorney-general ?³⁰

The Character of Charles. He proceeds to detail a long succession of anecdotes, for the purpose of displaying the sanguinary disposition attributed to Charles. The credulity of the reviewer in this instance is truly edifying : but he should have remembered, that tales fabricated at a time, when men were maddened with rage and revenge, will be received with distrust by the sober judgment of the reader. They may grace the pages of a review, but can claim no place in legitimate history.³¹ I

³⁰ La Popelinière, ii. 67.

³¹ The reviewer has omitted one of these fabrications, which, were it a genuine document, would decide at once the controversy between us. A huguenot writer has preserved a letter, which he assures us, was sent by the queen mother to Strozzi, who commanded 6000 men in the neighbourhood of Rochelle, in *April*, with a strict injunction not to open it till the 24th of August. (*Mémoires, de l'estat*, i. 220.) The following are the contents. “Strossy. Je vous avertis que jourd’huy 24. d’Aoust, l’Amiral et tous les huguenots, qui estoient ici avec luy, ont esté tuez. Partant avisez diligement à vous rendre maistre de la Rochelle : et faites aux huguenots, qui vous tomberont entre les mains le mesme, que nous avons fait à ceux-ci. Gardez vous

shall not notice them in particular ; but shall oppose to them a few undeniable testimonies, which will disclose the true state of the royal mind before, during, and after the massacre.

1. In the memoir I mentioned, on the credit of the duke of Anjou, the visible reluctance with which Charles had given his consent. The same is asserted from his own words by his sister, queen Margaret.³² If we believe the protestant writer of the *Mémoires de l'estat*, his indecision was to the last the cause of alarm to the conspirators, and Catharine had recourse to all her arts, "to screw his courage to the sticking place." Accompanied by her *femme de chambre*, she went to his apartment about midnight, and took him with her to the council ; and afterwards ordered the signal to be given before the appointed time, through fear that he might revoke his consent.³³

2. While Charles was standing with his mother and brother at the balcony waiting for the signal, they heard the report of a pistol. The sound threw them into such agitation, that a messenger was instantly despatched in the king's name to the duke

bien d'y faire faute, autant que craignez de desplaire au Roy, monsieur mon fils, et à moy. Catharine." This most impudent forgery has not at present any apologists ; but I have mentioned it, that the reader may judge what credit is due to the reports and fabrications of the time.

³² A ce que je luy ai depuis ouy dire à luy-mesme, il y eust beaucoup de peine à l'y faire consentir ; et sans ce qu'on luy fit entendre, qu'il y alloit de sa vie et de son estat, il ne l'eust jamais fait. *Mémoires*, lii. 173.

³³ *Mémoires de l'estat*, i. 285. 286. Thuan. iii. 128.

of Guise with a revocation of the former order. He arrived too late.³⁴

3. We are told by Tavannes, who was present, that Charles and his mother, during the massacre, remained trembling with terror in the Louvre.³⁵

4. Sully assures us that it was observed as early as the evening of the 24th, that the king was seized with an involuntary shuddering, as often as he heard any one boasting in his presence of the bloody feats, which had been performed in the tragedy.³⁶

5. D'Aubigné, another protestant, and familiarly acquainted with Charles, asserts from his own knowledge, and the testimony of some of the first personages in France, that during the two years which he lived after the St. Bartholomew, the king's sleep was often interrupted by starts and groans, and exclamations bordering on despair; that he frequently declared his abhorrence of the deed, that he gradually removed from his councils those who had advised it, and that he even sought to free himself from the presence of the queen-mother, by proposing to her a visit to the duke of Anjou, then king of Poland.³⁷

³⁴ Ne scaurois dire s'il offensa quelqu'un : bien sai-je que le son nous blessa tous trois si avant dans l'esprit, qu'il offensa nos sens et notre jugement, épris de terreur et d'appréhension. Mémoires de Villeroy, ii. 76.

³⁵ Le sang et la mort courent les rues en telle horreur, que leurs majestéz mesmes, qui en estoient les auteurs, ne se pouvoient garder de peur dans le Louvre. Mémoires, xxvii. 271.

³⁶ Dès le soir du 24 Aoust, on s'aperçut qu'il frémissait malgré lui, au recit de mille traits de cruauté, d'ont chacun venoit se faire honneur en sa présence. Mémoires de Sully, i. 70. edit. 1752.

³⁷ Depuis la St. Barthelemy ce prince n'avoit repos qu' entrerompue de tressaux et de gemissemens, qui se terminoient en reniement tendans au desespoir . . . comme il detestoit fort souvent le massacre,

If the reader give credit to these testimonies, and they are of the highest order which the subject admits, he will be at no loss to form his opinion of the opprobrious tales so ostentatiously put forward in the review, or of the critical impartiality of him, by whose industry they were collected.

The subsequent Massacres. The barbarities exercised at Paris were followed as a precedent in several other places. "The sufferers," I said, "believed that, as they were not protected, they were persecuted by the command of the court. But the memory of Charles needs not to be loaded with additional infamy. There is no evidence that the other massacres had his sanction or permission, and, when we consider that they happened at very different periods, and were confined to places in which the blood of the catholics had been wantonly spilt during the preceding insurrections, we shall attribute them rather to sudden ebullitions of popular vengeance than to any previously concerted and general plan."

To this observation the reviewer of course objects. He maintains that the succeeding enormities in the provinces grew out of the orders transmitted from the king, and in support of his opinion produces the evidence of several writers. To them I may be allowed to oppose the following documents and remarks.

Public Orders. 1. Despatches dated the 24th of August were sent to all the superior authorities in the kingdom. In these the king attributes the

il avoit desja esloigné des affaires ceux qui luy avoient donné ce mauvais conseil, voire même jusqu' à vouloir envoyer la Reyne mere. D'Aubigné, ii. 129.

recent massacre at Paris to the ancient quarrel between the house of Guise and the admiral, orders proclamation to be every where made that the articles of the late pacification should be strictly observed, and that no man should on any pretence take up arms or offer violence to others, and instructs his officers to put down every tumult, and to provide for the security of his towns and castles. These despatches were accompanied with a form of proclamation prohibiting unlawful arms, and all assemblies or proceedings in violation of the late articles of peace.³⁸

Within three days, on August 27th, we meet with other despatches of a similar tendency, with orders to punish severely all persons, who should attempt to raise tumults similar to that which had taken place in Paris.³⁹

On the 28th the king publishes a declaration that, to preserve his own life, he has been obliged to take summary justice on the admiral, and the admiral's adherents. In the same instrument he gives to all his subjects of the reformed religion the assurance of his protection, and forbids any injury to be offered to them under pain of death, but at the same time, to prevent suspicion and bloodshed, prohibits them from assembling for the purpose of divine worship, till he have provided for the tranquillity of the kingdom.⁴⁰

With this instrument were despatched, on the 30th, two other letters. One ordered the declaration to be published with the usual formalities, required the magistrates to forbid all assemblies of reli-

³⁸ Mem. de l'estat, i. 296—300.

³⁹ Ibid. 319.

⁴⁰ Ibid. 322.

gionists for worship, or any other purpose, “ afin d’oter toute doute et suspicion que pour ce l’on pourroit concevoir ;” and authorized them to punish the disobedient as rebels and enemies of the throne : the other instructed the governors to issue letters of protection to protestant families, which should be as valid as if they had been signed by the king himself, to execute prompt and exemplary justice on all catholics who should presume to injure any protestant, and to dissuade by every argument in their power the protestants from continuing their religious assemblies, because “ il est tout certain, que cela est cause d’empirer et augmenter les dits emotions.⁴¹”

Verbal Orders—Such were the public orders and proclamations issued by the king ; which appear to acquit him of all participation in the subsequent massacres. The reviewer, however, in support of his opinion, appeals to secret and verbal orders of a contrary tendency, supposed to have been issued at the same time. That verbal orders were issued, and that they were unfavourable to the huguenot party, is true : but this circumstance is not sufficient to support the view which my opponent has taken of the subject. 1. For it should be observed that the public orders were general : they extended to the whole kingdom : the verbal orders were addressed only to particular persons. This is plain from the following instance :—The baron de Gordes, governor of Dauphiné, having received a written order revoking all verbal orders, returned for answer on the 5th of September, that he had not received any verbal order at all. The king replied

⁴¹ Mém. de l’etat, i. 354. 372.

on the 14th that it was a matter of no consequence, as the verbal orders had been addressed only to certain persons. Dont ne vous mettez en aucune peine : car elles s'adessoient seulement a quelques uns, qui s'estoyent trouvéz pres de moy.⁴²

2. What was the purport of these verbal orders ? By them, as far as I can learn, the king's officers, in those places where the huguenots were numerous, received instructions to make themselves the stronger party, "de faire ensorte qu'ils demeurassent les plus forts," and to adopt the most prompt and vigorous measures for the prevention of any insurrection, in consequence of the late proceedings in Paris. Thus we read in the memoirs of Jean Philippi, that on Saturday the 30th, the courier arrived at Montpellier ; the troops were immediately put under arms, sentinels were placed at the doors of the protestant inhabitants, and the most factious were put in confinement. Thus matters remained till the 8th of September, when the royal declaration of the 28th was published.⁴³ We find the same precautions taken at Macon, Orleans, Bourges, Lyons, and other places. I am, however, aware that many writers have given to these orders a more sanguinary character. But there is reason to believe, as the reader will shortly see, that they wrote not from

⁴² Mém. de l'estat, i. 405.

⁴³ Le Samedi passa par Montpellier un courier du roy apportant la nouvelle de la S. Barthélemi : on prit d'abord les armes, et on mit garde aux portes de ceux de la religion, et on emprisonna les plus factieux . . . Le 8 Septembre on publia une ordonnance du Roi du 28 Aout, qui vouloit que ses sujets protestans vécussent en surété, et defendoit les prêches et assemblées. He adds that en Languedoc il n'y eut pay le moindre excès par la bonne conduite de Joyeuse. Mémoires, xlv. 406. 407.

actual knowledge, but conjectured the cause from the event: and even the more ancient and best informed among them are careful to confine their assertions to certain particular places, and to the execution of certain obnoxious individuals.⁴⁴

3. How long did these orders remain in force? That they were revoked we know from the reviewer himself, who refers to two manuscript copies of the revocation. *J'ai revoqué et revoque tout cela, ne voulant que par vous ni autre en soit aucune chose exécutée.* It is of some importance to ascertain the date of this revocation, which the reviewer has by some oversight omitted, and which I shall therefore supply from the printed copy.⁴⁵ It was dated the 30th of August, and accompanied a circular order for the discharge of all persons, with a few exceptions, who had been confined in consequence of the verbal orders. I said that the date was of importance, because—1^o, the massacres which afterwards took place, must be attributed to some other cause; and 2^o, because that cause, the excitement and rage of the people, was as likely to lead to such atrocities before as after the revocation. If it required no order of the sovereign in one case, neither did it in the other.

⁴⁴ Thus we are told in the *Mémoires de l'estat*, that the orders were sent to the governors of the towns known to contain considerable numbers of religionists: *Le conseil secret avoit despeché lettres aux gouverneurs des villes remarquées (ou il y avoit nombre de gens de la religion,) pour saccager ceux de la religion: (i. 327.)* and by Tavannes that the orders were to put only the factious and their leaders to death, but that the passions of the people could not be restrained. *Plusieurs villes du Royaume tuent non seulement les chefs et factieux, comme il leur avoit été commandé; ains se gouvernent en cette effrénée licence Parisienne. xxvii. 271.*

⁴⁵ *Mémoires de l'estat*, 355. 322.

4. To judge of general assertions we ought to descend to particulars. Now, with respect to the governors of provinces, I cannot find that any outrage of consequence was perpetrated by their command, or with their connivance in any part of France.⁴⁶ It is for my opponents, who suppose that they received orders to put to death the protestants within their respective jurisdictions, to account for their apathy and disobedience. I know that many have been highly praised on this very account; but I do not believe that they were entitled to such praise. Among the number is reckoned the baron de Gordes, whom I have already mentioned; we have even his supposed answer, that he would not obey: he could not believe that such inhuman orders emanated from the king. Yet the whole is a fiction. From the letter of Charles, published in the *Mémoires de l'estat*, it is plain that Gordes had never received any order of that description, whether written or verbal, and, consequently, had not the opportunity of deserving the praise of disobedience.⁴⁷ Were sufficient means of inquiry

⁴⁶ In Picardy and Bretagne the huguenots were not molested: the governors of the Isle of France, of Champagne, Burgundy, Auvergne, Languedoc, Guienne, Dauphiné, and Provence are praised for the protection which they afforded them: and those of Berry, Poitou, and Brie, are mentioned without any censure, whence the same may be presumed of them. The only other governor whose name I have seen noticed, is Tanneguy le Veneur, who opposed to the best of his power, but in vain, the disturbances in Normandy. De Serres, iii. 190. *Mém. de l'estat*, i. 360, 374, 406, 407. Thuan. iii. 141. 4. 5. 6.

⁴⁷ Gordes is praised for his disobedience by d'Aubigné, De Thou, and the author of the *Mémoires de l'estat*, i. 360. who adds that he excused himself repeatedly, 406. Yet the king's letter in p. 404,

afforded, it is not improbable that the other governors would be found equally unconscious with de Gordes of that merit, which has drawn from historians such high encomiums on their conduct.

5. From the governors of provinces we may proceed to the governors of towns: for it is to them chiefly, if not solely, that the sanguinary orders, supposing any to have been issued, must have been addressed. Now, out of all the towns in France there are only seven, Meaux, la Charité, Orleans, Saumur, Angers, Lyons, and Troyes,⁴⁸ in which massacres took place before the revocation of the verbal orders, and the proclamation of the public order of the 28th of August; and yet in these seven it must be confessed to be extremely doubtful whether the outrages were in reality provoked by any orders from the king. In one instance this has been inferred, merely because the troubles began the day after the arrival of a courier: in the cases of Orleans and Troyes, no orders are pretended; and in the other four the assertion is indeed made, but unsupported by satisfactory authority. In most, if not in all, the true

shews that Gordes had received no other orders than those of the twenty-fourth, according to which he had secured all the places in his government of Dauphiné. The same may perhaps be inferred of the count de Tende, from the same letter. The story of the orders brought to him and his successor, by la Mole, is in the *Mémoires de l'estat*, 406, and in Castelnau (ii. 15.) taken from the collection of Peiresc. It is liable to so many objections from dates and contradictions that it deserves no credit.

⁴⁸ The king's proclamation arrived at Troyes on the 3d of September; but I have included that town in the number, because it was not published till the 5th, and the murders took place in the interval. *Mém. de l'estat*, i. 337—342.

origin was probably that, which is assigned by De Thou as the cause of the massacre at Orleans, the excited state of the public mind, and the recollection of past injuries, which was hourly renewed by the sight of the churches formerly laid in ruins through the zeal or resentment of the huguenots. *Summa Aureliani intemperies fuit, quod, semel atque iterum a Protestantibus occupatum, fœdis eversorum templorum ruinis in oculos irruentibus animos plebis in ultionem, recentibus adhuc odiis, accendebat.*⁴⁹

6. The perpetration, however, of these outrages induced the king to complain on the 14th of Sept. that though he had published his declaration of the 28th of Aug. and signified his will that it should be strictly obeyed, yet to his great displeasure similar atrocities continue to be committed: wherefore he repeats his former prohibition, orders the transgressors to be punished with a severity which may prove a lesson to others, and declares his resolution of calling to account all those who shall dissemble, or connive at such excesses.⁵⁰

In another letter to the duke of Guise of the 18th, he asserts that he will compel obedience ; that his orders shall not be disobeyed with impunity, and assures his cousin, that the most agreeable news which he can send him, will be the punishment of some of those who transgress his commands.⁵¹

⁴⁹ Thuan. iii. 141.

⁵⁰ Estant bien mon intention de les chastier comme il appartient, et de m'en prendre à ceux qui voudront user de connivence et dissimulation. *Mém. de l'estat*, i. 405.

⁵¹ Vous asseurant, mon cousin, que la plus agreeable nouvelle que je puisse apprendre de vous, ce sera d'ouyr dire, que vous avez faict quelque bon chastiment de ceux de qui j'auray esté desobey. *Ibid*, 416.

7. But it was in vain that he multiplied his despatches and complaints. He was unable to govern the vast machine which he had set in motion. The fury of the people was not to be restrained by the authority of the sovereign. In defiance of the royal prohibitions, similar disturbances continued to break out in different places: in the month of September murders were committed at Bourges, Rouen, Romans, and Toulouse; and it was not before the middle of October, after the massacre at Bourdeaux, that the popular fury was spent, and tranquillity generally restored. Of all these excesses, the responsibility must in some measure rest with the king, inasmuch as, had he not consented to the Parisian massacre, they would never have happened: but few, I trust, who have weighed the preceding remarks, will believe that they were perpetrated by his order, or with his approbation. In effect, the different times at which they took place, including the lapse of six weeks, shew that they proceeded not from any previously concerted plan; and the fact, that they were confined to certain towns, in which similar atrocities had been exercised by the huguenots on the catholic inhabitants, points out their real origin, in the hatred and resentment of the people.

Number of the slain. With regard to the number of the slain, little reliance can be placed on the conflicting conjectures of historians. We all know that the mind in a state of excitement, is prone to exaggeration; that in such cases tens are speedily multiplied into hundreds, and hundreds into thousands. But with this I have little concern. I took Caveyrac for my guide, and to Caveyrac I referred

the reader as my sole authority.⁵² It seems, however, that in treating the subject, the reviewer himself is infected with the spirit of amplification. He cannot quote my words "that the protestant martyrologist procured lists of the names," without representing me as saying that the martyrologist "used uncommon industry, and took extraordinary pains, to procure such lists."⁵³ But though I said it not, I have no doubt that extraordinary pains were taken. Not only are the names of the victims mentioned in the enumeration of the slain, but the occupations which they followed, the streets in which they lived, the very signs which hung over their doors, are frequently added. Could this have been done unless more than common industry had been employed?

Conference of Catharine with the Earl of Worcester. When the earl of Worcester who had come as ambassador extraordinary, to the king of France, had his audience of leave of the queen-mother, she asked him the reason why the queen of England behaved with so much coolness towards her son and her. The earl, having first been prompted by Walsingham, the resident ambassador, in English, assigned the massacre as the principal cause. "My lady mother," says Charles, in a letter, detailing the conversation to La Motte Fenelon, his ambassador in England, "replied, that in regard to what had occurred in these latter days, Walsingham must have seen how it happened by the fault of the chiefs of those, who remained here. For, when the late admiral was treacherously wounded at

⁵² Hist. viii.

⁵³ Review.

“ Notre Dame, he knew the affliction it threw us
 “ into (fearful it might have occasioned great
 “ troubles in this kingdom,) and the diligence we
 “ used to verify judicially whence it proceeded : and
 “ the verification was nearly finished, when they
 “ were so forgetful as to raise a conspiracy to at-
 “ tempt the lives of myself, my lady mother, and
 “ my brothers, and endanger the whole state : which
 “ was the cause that to avoid this I was compelled,
 “ to my great regret, to permit what had happened
 “ in this city ; but, as he had witnessed, I gave
 “ orders to stop, as soon as possible, this fury of the
 “ people, and to place every one in repose. On
 “ this the sieur Walsingham replied to my lady and
 “ mother, that the exercise of the said religion had
 “ been interdicted in this kingdom. To which she
 “ also answered, that this had not been done but for
 “ a good and holy purpose : namely, that the fury
 “ of the catholic people might the sooner be allayed :
 “ who else had been reminded of the past calamities,
 “ and would again have been let loose against those
 “ of the said religion, had they continued the
 “ preachings (public assemblies of worship) in this
 “ kingdom. Giving him clearly and pointedly to
 “ understand, that what is done here, is much the
 “ same as what has been done, and is now practised
 “ by the queen, his mistress, in her kingdom. For
 “ she permits but the exercise of one religion, though
 “ there are many of her people who are of another :
 “ and has also during her reign punished those of
 “ her subjects whom she found seditious and rebel-
 “ lious. It is true that this has been done by the
 “ laws ; but I indeed could not act in that manner.
 “ For, finding myself in such imminent peril, and

“ the conspiracy against me and mine and my
 “ kingdom ready to be executed, I had no time to
 “ arraign and try in open justice, as much I wished,
 “ but was constrained, to my very great regret, to
 “ strike the blow in what has been done in this
 “ city.”⁵⁴

I do not transcribe this passage for the purpose of inferring from it that the admiral had really conspired against the king, (though Charles had been taught to believe it,) but to point out to the reader three things, corroborative of my preceding statement, for the truth of which Catharine appeals to the personal knowledge of Walsingham: that a real inquiry had been set on foot to discover the origin of the attempt on the admiral's life, that the subsequent massacre was provoked by the intemperate conduct of his adherents, and that the king, as soon as possible, gave orders to stop the fury of the populace. Walsingham, from his residence in Paris, and his relations with the chiefs of the huguenots, must have known the truth. Can we then believe that Catharine would have had the face to appeal to him, or that he, when thus called upon, would have silently acquiesced, had her statements been untrue?

⁵⁴ See D'Israeli's second series of the *Curiosities of Literature*, (ii. 409, 410.) who has translated the greater part of the original despatch.

CHAPTER II.

Murder of Lignerolles—League at Bayonne—Misstatement of the Reviewer—Massacre at Vassy—Memorial of Tavannes—Charles and Alessandrino—Intercepted Letters—Inconsistency of the Court—Objection drawn from the attempt on the Admiral's life solved by the Reviewer—Remarks on that Solution—Misstatement—Testimony of Chateaubriand.

I FLATTER myself that in the preceding chapter I have proved to the satisfaction of the reader, 1. that the charges against me of ignorance, and bad faith, and misrepresentation, have been rashly and groundlessly advanced; 2. that the hypothesis of a preconcerted plot is unsupported by satisfactory authority, and liable, on the score of improbability, to the most formidable objections; 3. and that the massacres in the provinces were confined to a few places, and originated principally, if not entirely, in the vindictive passions of the people. Here the controversy between the reviewer and myself ought to close. But it has pleased him to prolong it, and I see no reason why I should shrink from the contest.

Murder of Lignerolles. Having, therefore, reached the end of the memoir, he abandons the St. Bar-

tholomew for a while, under the pretence of discovering and exposing my numerous misrepresentations in other parts of French history. With this view he falls back from the year 1572 to 1571, and charges me with insinuating that the assassination of Lignerolles was the work of the French protestants. Whether my words furnish any foundation for the charge, I will not determine: but that I meant not to convey any such insinuation, I shall affirm. My object was simply to state the fact of the murder, and, at the same time, avoid the question, who were its authors. The latter is still a subject of controversy among the French critics: to the writer and reader of English history it was a matter of no interest or importance.¹

League of Bayonne. Pursuing his retrograde course, the reviewer comes next to the year 1565, and takes his stand at the conferences at Bayonne. In that city the king, with the queen-mother, met his sister Isabella of Spain, accompanied by the duke of Alva. The huguenots (*genus hominum suspicax*, says de Thou,²) would not believe that this was a mere family meeting: such personages, they argued, must have in view some more important object than to see one another; and that object could be nothing less than the destruction of the reformed faith. A private gallery connected the

¹ It took place in the year 1571, when the court was at Bourgueil. De Thou says that many of those, who were there, even protestants as well as catholics, as he afterwards learned from themselves, were persuaded that the king at that time had never thought of the massacre, which followed in the next year. Thuan. iii. 66.

² Thuan. ii. 435.

apartments of the two queens, and here, it was said, political subjects were discussed after the amusements of the day. The meeting at length broke up, and immediately a report was circulated that a league had been concluded between the two crowns for the extermination of the French and Flemish protestants. Of this supposed league, however, the huguenot leaders produced no other proof than their own suspicions: suspicions to which they themselves gave but little credit, if we may judge from the facility with which, on more than one occasion, they trusted themselves to the mercy of the court.³ Seven years later followed the St. Bartholomew: the survivors immediately exclaimed that their former suspicions had now been verified; and this opinion was adopted by that class of writers who attribute nothing to the sudden impulse of passion, or the unforeseen necessity of circumstances, but consider every event as the result of political sagacity and preparatory arrangement.

“Dr. Lingard *boasts*,” says the reviewer, that ‘of this league no satisfactory evidence has ever been produced.’ If he mean that the articles of the treaty have never been published, he is in the right. They were probably never reduced to writing. But, if the concurrent opinions of the very best writers of the age, catholic as well as protestant, be admitted as an evidence of an historical fact, there can be no doubt that plans were discussed and measures projected at Bayonne, for the destruction of heresy in France.”⁴

³ Particularly at Moulins, in 1566. See also the remarks of Mont-luc in the *Mémoires de l'estat*, ii. 63.

⁴ Rev. 119.

Of the boasting here attributed to me, the reader will find no trace in my pages. I simply made the assertion : and of its truth I wish for no better proof than is here furnished by my adversary. He begins, indeed, by talking of a treaty and the articles of a treaty ; but, as he proceeds, he is careful to lower his pretensions, and concludes with a promise to shew that “ plans were discussed and measures projected at Bayonne.”—But “ plans discussed and measures projected ” are not a treaty. Granting that he has proved so much, still he will not have proved the point in question, still he will have produced no satisfactory evidence of the supposed league at Bayonne. It will, therefore, be unnecessary for me to make any observations on the passages which he has quoted, liable as they are to numerous objections. For my purpose it is sufficient that by his own confession, they do no more than shew that the dangers which threatened Charles from the insurrections of the huguenots, and those which threatened Philip from the designs of the Gueux, formed the frequent subject of deliberation between the parties. In such circumstances this was natural. But the mutual communication of advice, and the persuasion that in such cases it was for the interest of each crown to support the other, cannot in any sense of the words be said to constitute a league or treaty.⁵

⁵ But how did the secret of these conferences transpire ? According to some by the agency of a little dog, who stole a letter out of the cabinet of the duchess of Guise. But this, though a very interesting story, the reviewer has suppressed. He prefers the story of the young prince of Bearn, who heard the duke of Alva say that he preferred the jole of a salmon to a hundred frogs. The prince was twelve years old,

Evidence of Philip of Spain. Dissatisfied with the dubious testimony of historians, I made it my endeavour to seek out more authentic evidence. In the correspondence of Walsingham, I found a denial on the part of Catharine, that any political business had been transacted at Bayonne: but this I did not mention, because she was interested in the denial. In Strada I discovered the abstract of a letter from Philip of Spain to the archduchess Margaret, who governed the Low Countries, in which the former professed to give to the latter an account of the conferences at Bayonne. He says, “that the Spanish queen, having entreated her brother and mother to apply some remedy to the dangerous state of religion in France, found them extremely well disposed towards the counsels which were discussed; and that several marriages, and an alliance against the Turks were proposed, but nothing was settled, the queen declining every other subject but that of religion, which at the suggestion of Alva, she again recommended to her brother and mother, and the meeting broke up.”⁶ If we consider to whom and by whom this letter was written, we must admit it as authentic evidence, and in that case it is most evident that no political treaty whatever was concluded.

Misstatement of the Reviewer. In a short note at the foot of the page, I had briefly mentioned this letter, in proof of my assertion: and the reviewer snatches the opportunity to charge me with the guilt of suppressing some of these particulars: as

and a sagacious boy for his age; otherwise he would never have divined the secret meaning of the duke, but have supposed that he was talking of the dishes on the table.—See Rev. 120.

⁶ Strada, 109.

if it were the duty of the historian to convert his notes into dissertations, and to fill his pages with every trifling circumstance, which a captious opponent may think favourable to his own hypothesis. Nor is this all. If we may believe him, I have suppressed the important information that “the historian who procured this correspondence, was inclined to believe that the massacre of St. Bartholomew was concerted at this meeting.” Now I must beg of the reader to notice the very ingenious process by which this imaginary suppression is proved. “The historian,” says he, “adds that many have thought the massacre of the heretics at Paris, executed seven years afterwards, was planned at this interview; ‘*id quod mihi neque abnuere neque affirmare promptum fuerit, potius inclinatus ut credam.*’”⁷ This, at first view, has a plausible appearance: but a reference to the original will instantly expose the fraud. The words are—*Id, quod mihi neque abnuere neque affirmare promptum fuerit. Potius inclinatus ut credam, et mutua Gallorum in Belgium, atque hinc in Galliam adversus religionis principumque rebelles auxilia, quæ sæpius dehinc submissa vidimus, et Caroli regis cum Elizabetha Maximiliani imperatoris filia matrimonium, quinto post anno celebratum, ab eo colloquio provenisse.*⁸ Now, if this passage be compared with the

⁷ Review, 118.

⁸ Strada, de Bello Belgico, lib. iv. p. 109. Romæ 1640. This is the best edition. I know not whether it be the edition quoted by the reviewer, but the number of the page is the same. I have consulted several other editions, which agree both in words and punctuation. The same may be said of the old English and French translations.

quotation by the reviewer, it will be found that, to effect his purpose, he has taken the last of the two sentences, and divided it into unequal portions. Of these, the first and shorter he adds to the sentence preceding, as one of its component parts: of the second, which after the division retains no meaning, he does not make mention: he conceals the mutilated remains from the eye of the reader, though he has carefully surveyed them himself, and discovered that they include a hint of mutual assistance. The contrivance is ingenious: Strada is made to say the very reverse of that which he really said: he is made to say that he inclines to adopt the opinion of those, who believe that the Parisian massacre was concerted at Bayonne; whereas, he really says that, instead of adopting that opinion, he is inclined to believe that two other things, viz. the occasional supply of aid from one crown to the other, and the marriage of Charles to the daughter of the emperor, were the real effects of the conference. To characterize this most singular perversion of testimony, I shall not borrow any of those offensive terms which are of such frequent use, in the reviewer's vocabulary. I will not call it carelessness or ignorance, bad faith or misrepresentation, indifference to historical accuracy, or an attempt to deceive the reader. Perhaps it was no more than an oversight, occasioned by precipitancy, by that eagerness for victory, which so often blinds and misleads the judgment. But, be it what it may, the detection will teach him this useful lesson, that it becomes the man, who has to crave forbearance for his own delinquencies, to view with a more indulgent eye the failings, whether they be real or only imaginary, of others.

Affray at Vassy. Continuing to move backwards, the reviewer comes to the sanguinary tumult at Vassy, in the year 1562. I casually mentioned it, not in the body of the work, but in a short note, and to that note he opposes three objections. 1. He upbraids me with calling it only an affray: but then at the same time he suppresses that I call it also a massacre. 2. He will not allow that it was provoked by the religionists themselves.—The authorities are indeed contradictory: but the reviewer acknowledges that, on the part of the duke of Guise, the affair was accidental, and I demand no more. 3. I said, that the Calvinists at Nismes began to arm on the 19th of Feb. at the sound of the drum, and defeated de Flassans on March 6th. The reviewer, from Menard's history of Nismes, contends that, "if these troops were raised by beat of drum, at Nismes, before the *affair* of Vassy, it was under a commission from the king; and, if an action was fought at Bargols, it was by order of his lieutenant general." There cannot, however, be a doubt that this was an arming of the huguenots. Crussol, the lieutenant, was known to be their friend, Cardet, to whom he gave the commission, had distinguished himself in their service, and the men, whom he raised, were all of them huguenots, for the express purpose of fighting against the catholics. Crussol, having collected his force, marched to reduce Flassans, the first consul of Aix. I shall not trouble the reader with the merits of the quarrel between them. Of the two contemporary historians, the catholic Perussis is positive that Flassans was in the right, the protestant Regnault that he was in the wrong. He retired before the superior number of the enemy:

his last defence, the wall of Barjols, was scaled; and three or nine hundred men (for the authorities differ,) perished by the swords of the conquerors. When Crussol began this enterprise, he could boast of the royal commission; for Catharine was at that time united with the huguenot leaders: when he had gained the victory, he was deprived of his office, for she had then passed over to the catholics. But the former rewarded his services: they appointed him, in opposition to the court, governor of Languedoc.⁹—The truth is, outrages were daily committed by both parties; and, if the Prince of Condé selected the massacre at Vassy as a justification of hostilities, it was because it enabled him to throw the blame on his rival the duke of Guise, who was accidentally implicated in that affair.

Proof of preconcerted plot by the reviewer. The reviewer concludes thus: "We are tired, and so probably are our readers, with tracing Dr. Lingard through his numerous mistakes and misrepresentations; and, if the instances of carelessness and bad faith, which we have collected from so small a portion of his book, are insufficient to convince them that truth is neglected in his history, and that prejudice and partiality usurp its place, we despair of producing conviction."¹⁰ On the arrogant and insulting tone of this paragraph I shall make no comment. The review and the vindication are now before the public; and the public must judge between us. One thing is sufficiently apparent, that in the midst of his imaginary triumph, the reviewer betrays symptoms

⁹ Rev. 123. Menard, iv. 336. Thuan. ii. 233, 306. Perrin, Mem. xliii. 480.

¹⁰ Rev. 125.

of considerable uneasiness. He is still aware that he has to answer the question, why, in his hypothesis, the attempt was made on the single life of the admiral, at a time when the destruction of the whole body of the huguenots was in contemplation: and it is with evident reluctance that he prepares to grapple with the difficulty. Forgetful that he has already "tired himself and tired his readers," he still compels them to travel through no fewer than five-and-twenty closely printed pages, before he will allow them a glimpse of the promised land. It is not till he has disposed of a variety of preliminary questions, that he will venture to propound his solution. I shall follow him in his fretful fitful course: but my progress shall be rapid, and my remarks confined to a few of the most important subjects.

His misrepresentation of the memoir of Tavannes.

1. To prove the existence of a preconcerted plot to get possession of the chiefs of the huguenots, the reviewer appeals to a confidential communication made by Tavannes to the king in 1571. "The marshall," he says, "there discusses in what manner hostilities are likely to be renewed. He pronounces that the war will re-commence by one party attempting to seize on the chief persons of the opposite side, and recommends various precautionary measures to the king and his brothers, to guard them from sudden attack. With respect to the huguenots, he observes, that to surprise the places they possess, to extinguish their religion, or to break their alliances with foreign powers, is impossible, 'Ainsi, il n'y a moyen que de prendre les chefs tout à la fois, pour y mettre un fin.' 'Les choses,' he adds, 'sont en bon train pour venir au dessus des

affaires, pourvu que l'on ne se laisse attraper : et leur faut tenir parole, pour ne leur donner occasion de prendre les armes.'"¹¹

This passage is a most valuable specimen of the art of the reviewer. By bringing into juxta-position passages which lie at a distance from each other, and by converting the premises into the conclusion, and the conclusion into the premises, he has contrived to communicate to the memoir of Tavannes a meaning which was never contemplated by that statesman. His object was to warn the king of the danger, and to propose precautions against the possibility of a surprise. In the preface he remarks, that the exhaustion of the two parties will compel them to observe the articles of pacification, though, to judge from experience, there can be little doubt that either of them will seize a favourable opportunity, if any such should offer, of putting an end to the contest at once. Now, nothing can be so likely to effect this, as for one of the parties to make prisoners of the chiefs of the other : for it is as impossible for the huguenots to make themselves masters of the whole kingdom, as for the royalists to surprise the places of the huguenots, reduce their religion, and break their foreign alliances. This then, the capture of the chiefs of one party by the other, is the only means of putting an end to the contest for ever : now that the royalists should obtain possession of the huguenot chiefs is out of the question : they are always on their guard. But let not the king deceive himself : it will be easy for the huguenots to obtain possession of the royal family, unless precautions are employed. For there is no place, particularly in

¹¹ Rev. 127.

the vicinity of Paris, where they cannot collect within twenty-four hours, seven or eight hundred horsemen, besides their adherents in attendance on the court, or resident in the capital. After this preface, he details his plan for keeping on all occasions so large a force in the neighbourhood of the court, as may render a surprise impracticable ; and then concludes by observing, that the king is now in the way of getting over his difficulties, if he does not allow himself to be surprised. He must keep faith with the huguenots, that they may not have a pretext to arm in their own defence, but that he may have time to arm before them : for if he have time, it is certain that they will be continually beaten. The only danger is in a surprise : that would be certain ruin ; but against that the plan which he has proposed, will prove a safeguard.¹²

This is the substance of the memoir, and I have given it at some length, that the reader may observe the ingenuity with which the reviewer has misrepresented its meaning, in the passage which I have already quoted from him ; and may admire the boldness with which he proceeds to assert, that “ the policy here recommended by Tavannes, is precisely that which the court is charged by its enemies with having followed ; viz. to quiet the suspicions of the huguenots by a faithful execution of the treaty, and to take advantage of the confidence inspired by that

¹² Mémoires, xxvii. 198. I have omitted the marshal's plan, because it has no relation to the present controversy. Though, for the sake of brevity, I have given the substance of the preface and conclusion, instead of translating the very words, I have no doubt that I have every where faithfully preserved his meaning.

conduct, to bring together and secure their chiefs.”¹³ Nothing can be more plain than that Tavannes anticipated no such thing as the possibility of bringing together and securing the chiefs. The advantage which he expected from the faithful execution of the treaty, was the opportunity of being the first in arms, which he was confident would give the victory to the king in every succeeding engagement. “Car si sa majesté a ce loisir (de lever les armes premiere-ment,) c’est chose seure qu’ils seront toujours battus.”¹⁴

His credulity. On this imaginary foundation, the pretended advice of Tavannes, the reviewer begins to rear his system, with the aid “of the best informed and most judicious of the *Italian* historians,” and in particular of his beloved Capilupi. Why Italian historians? Why not French? But he must be allowed to select his fellow labourers from what country he pleases. Of Capilupi, he tells us, that “he seems to have had his information from the persons most deeply connected with the contrivance and execution of the tragedy.”¹⁵ So it may seem to him: to me the work itself proves that Capilupi neither possessed any personal knowledge of the supposed plot, nor derived his information from any of the devisers of the tragedy. The news had reached Rome through different channels: and he was desirous of being the first to give to the public a connected and circumstantial account of the transaction. Under the pretence of answering a letter from his brother Alfonso, he published his narrative, but a narrative confessedly abounding in errors, and

¹³ Rev. 127.¹⁴ Mémoires, xxvii. 200.¹⁵ Rev. 129.

betraying great ignorance of French affairs.¹⁶ He was not, however, content with being merely a narrator. While he looked upon the massacre as the master-piece of human policy, he was grieved to observe that several among his acquaintance attributed it to accident and passion : and, to reclaim them from this political heresy, he was at the pains to collect a mass of tales and anecdotes, which might support his hypothesis. But what could he say to the silence of those concerned in the plot, not one of whom during twenty months betrayed the least hint of its existence? or to the blindness of the huguenots, who did not discover their danger? This, he tells us, was decreed by divine Providence : God had closed the eyes of one party, and the ears of the other : these were signs “*par lesquels sa divine majesté a fait voir au monde, qu'elle avoit divinement favorisé à cette entreprinse tres heureuse et admirable!*” With this “judicious historian,” the reviewer joins Davila and Adriani, writers of the same political school, who had learned, like Capilupi, and perhaps in his pages, to admire the consummate artifice which they discovered in the conduct of Charles and his mother. But I have already remarked how little credit is due to this class of historians. Till we know what authority they had for their assertions, we may be allowed to believe that they give us nothing better than their own suspi-

¹⁶ Some of these errors are exposed by a favourite author, De Thou, iii. 152. 153. There is a manuscript copy in the library of the Prince of Piombino, which, instead of the printed title, has the following. “*La morte di Gasparo Coligni ammiraglio, e d'altri ribelli seguita d'ordine di Carlo ix. Re di Francia, descritta da Camillo Capilupi al Sig. Alfonso Capilupi.* It is dated Oct. 22, 1572.

cions and conjectures, or the suspicions and conjectures of others.

In support of the credit of Adriani, the reviewer had previously asserted that he was supposed to have derived the materials of his history from the journal of Cosmo, grand duke of Tuscany, who died in 1574.¹⁷ In the course of a few pages, this conjecture ripens into certainty: the supposition disappears; and we are now told positively that "Adriani had access to the papers of the grand duke."¹⁸ But is it certain that he had access to these papers? Is there any reason to believe that the journal of the Italian prince contained authentic information respecting the transactions in France? Is it known that Cosmo ever wrote any journal at all? To these questions, if the reviewer return an answer, it must be that he knows nothing about the matter.¹⁹

He next discovers proof of the supposed plot in the anecdote told to D'Ossat by Clement VIII. who was in the suite of cardinal Alessandrino, when that prelate remonstrated with Charles IX. against the intended marriage between his sister Margaret and the young king of Navarre. Charles, taking him by the hand, is reported to have said, I would never consent if I had any other

¹⁷ Rev. 109. He refers to De Thou, but that author's words will hardly bear him out in the assertion. *Ex Cosmi Hetruriæ ducis commentariis, ut vero simile est, multa hausit.* Thuan. ii. 435. See Bayle's Dictionary, art. Adriani.

¹⁸ Rev. 129.

¹⁹ "Nous ignorons," says Perrin, "si Adriani a eu des mémoires de cette espèce entre les mains: mais il est bon de prévenir le lecteur que Riguccio Galluzzi, à qui de nos jours tous les archives florentines ont été ouvertes, n'en dit pas un mot dans son *Istoria del Granducato*." Mémoires, xliv. 421. c.

means of revenging myself on my enemies. “ Si j’avois quelque’ autre moyen de me venger de mes enemies.”²⁰ Anecdotes of this description, told from memory, and after the lapse of seven and twenty years, ought to be received with caution. Clement had written down the words at the time, and thought they might be found among the cardinal’s papers. Perhaps, had he made the search, he would have discovered some discrepancy of expression, which might have produced considerable difference in the meaning. The anecdote was not new : it had been often told : it had been published soon after the massacre by Capilupi, and Catena, and the author of the *Mémoires de l’etat*. Hearing that the queen of Navarre was on her way to the French court, to conclude the treaty of marriage, Alessandrino hastened to prevent her, and obtained an audience of the king at Blois before her arrival. To Charles he complained of his recent connection with the admiral, objected to the marriage as likely to add to the power of the huguenots, and maintained that it was both the interest and duty of the king to put them down as enemies to the altar and the throne. Charles, who was anxious to rid himself of the presence and importunities of the cardinal before the arrival of the queen of Navarre, replied that he could not with honour retract his word to the young king ; but that he acted with the best intention, and for the service of the church, as would afterwards be known. At the same time he drew a valuable ring from his finger, and offered it as a pledge of his attachment to the catholic faith ; but

it was declined by the cardinal, who replied that he could have no better pledge than the word of a king. This is all that was known to the contemporary protestant historian ;²¹ and this we may readily believe. But the answer attributed to Charles by Capilupi, and Catena, and Clement, that “ being unable to put down the huguenots by force, he must be allowed to do it in his own way, which would soon disclose his intentions: that he knew of no other means than the marriage to take vengeance on his enemies: that, if he could reveal his secret, the cardinal would know that nothing was so likely to produce the extermination of the heretics as the marriage,” appears to have been fashioned by themselves, and accommodated to their own notions of a preconcerted plot. If no plot existed, Charles could not have given such an answer; and if it did exist, we may safely say that he would not. The prince, who on so many other occasions had kept his secret, surely would have been sufficiently on his guard not to betray it then. Even de Thou finds it difficult to believe that he would have expressed himself in terms so open and undisguised.²²

Warnings given to the Admiral—Still less of proof can be drawn from the numerous admonitions given to the admiral.²³ They were times of jealousy and

²¹ Quant au mariage, il luy grevoit bien d'avoir desja donné la parole, et fait promesse au prince de Navarre, laquelle, il ne pouvoit fausser, son honneur sauve : bien asseuroit il la sainteté du Pape, que le tout se faisoit à tresbonne intention, et pour le service et grandeur de la religion catholique, comme on le connoistra cy apres. Mém. de l'estat, i. 208.

²² Capilupi, Lo Stratagema. Thuan. iii. 96. ²³ Rev. 136.

distrust : an obscure hint, a hasty expression, a mysterious occurrence, was sufficient to awaken alarm ; and the leaders on both sides were harassed by the officious solicitude of their friends, advising them of danger, and conjuring them to be upon their guard. But these warnings, by frequency of repetition, lost their effect : they were often received with expressions of disbelief, sometimes of reproof.²⁴ Those which the well-wishers of the admiral forwarded to him in Paris, with the reasons on which they were grounded, and his answers in refutation, have been published. A slight perusal will suffice to shew that the writers possessed no knowledge of any real plot.²⁵

Intercepted Letters.—The reviewer appeals next to an intercepted letter from the Cardinal de Pelvé to the cardinal of Lorraine. As well might he appeal to the letter of the queen-mother to Strozzi. For both we are originally indebted to the same writer, who brings them forward with equal confidence in proof of the plot. The latter is confessedly a fabrication : and who can affirm that the other is not ? Of all forgeries that of intercepted letters is the most easy. The copy, not the original, was sent to the admiral, with the expectation that it would awake in him some apprehension for his safety : the contempt with which he treated it, shews in what light it ought to be viewed.²⁶

²⁴ See a remarkable instance of such incredulity on the part of the court in Montluc, *Mém.* xxv. 13.

²⁵ *Mém. de l'estat*, i. 253. 260. *Thuan.* iii. 11 6.

²⁶ *Mém. de l'estat*, i. 218. Celuy qui envoya copie de ces lettres à l'amiral, espéroit que la lecture d'icelles le feroit penser à soy à bon

The apology of Charles for the Massacre. The king, by his despatches on the 24th had attributed the massacre to the family feud between the duke of Guise and the admiral. But the duke refused to take the odium on himself,²⁷ and Charles, in a few days, publicly avowed the transaction, stating that the order had been extorted from him by the necessity of preserving himself and the royal family from the traitorous designs of Coligni and his friends. The reviewer has employed seven pages in the refutation of this charge. It was certainly unnecessary. By all writers it is treated as a mere fiction, put forth by the court to justify the king's conduct in the eyes of his subjects and of foreign nations.²⁸ But I am sur-

escent. Mais il estoit tellement persuadé de la bienveillance et fidélité du roy, qu'il ne vid onque clair en ce sien fait propre. Ibid. Prophecies were also tried, but in vain. See Mem. pour servir à l'histoire de France, i. 17, 19.

²⁷ Tavannes, Mém. xxvii. 274.

²⁸ Though I am far from suspecting the admiral's friends of any treasonable intention, I have no doubt that they contemplated some very strong measure against the following morning. In addition to their threats and bravadoes during the day, queen Margaret informs us that the chief subject of conversation among the thirty or forty gentlemen who passed the night in the king of Navarre's bedchamber, was the attempt on the admiral, and the vengeance they would immediately take on the duke of Guise, if the king should refuse them justice. At day break her husband rose, told her he was going to play at tennis till the king should be awake, when he meant to demand justice on the assassins, and immediately left the room with all his attendants. Le roy mon mary, qui s'estoit mis au lit, me manda, que je m'en alasse coucher. Ce que je fis, et trouvay son lit entouré de trente ou quarante huguenots que je ne connoissois point encore; car il y avoit fort peu de temps que j'estois mariée. Toute la nuict ils ne firent que parler de l'accident qui estoit advenu à M. l'Admiral, se resolvans dès qu'il seroit jour, de demander justice au roy de M. de Guise, et que, si on ne la leur faisoit, ils se la feroient eux mesmes. Moy, j'avois tou-

prised that my opponent, in discussing the question, did not draw from it an inference unfavourable to his own hypothesis. Whence arose these contradictory statements put forth by the court? Suppose the massacre a sudden and unpremeditated measure, and they are easily understood. Its authors had been compelled to act, and had no leisure to arrange the subsequent proceedings. But if you take it for the result of a plot of two, or rather of seven, years standing, you must maintain that during this time its devisers had never fixed on the grounds on which it would be proper to justify their conduct. To me the conclusion of the viscount de Tavannes seems incontrovertible : that the inconsistent explanations published by the court, prove two things—1. that the admiral was innocent of the treason imputed to him ; and, 2. that the massacre was the result of a sudden and unpremeditated resolution.²⁹

The reviewer's solution of the difficulty.—At length, with the hope that he has sufficiently disposed the mind of the reader to admit the existence of the plot, he ventures to approach the difficulty which he has undertaken to solve. Why was the

jours dans le cœur les larmes de ma sœur, (see p. 27.) et ne pouvois dormir pour l'apprehension, en laquelle elle m'avoit mise sans scavoir de quoy. La nuit se passa de cette façon sans fermer l'œil. Au point du jour le roy mon mary dit qu'il vouloit aller jouer à la paume, attendant qui le roy Charles fust éveillé, se resolvant soudain de luy demander justice. Il sort de ma chambre, et tous ses gentilshommes aussi. Mémoires, tom 52. p. 180.

²⁹ L'exécution de l'acte avoit occupé les entendmens tellement, qu'ils vacilloient aux pretextes plusieurs fois changez selon les occurrences : montre qu'il n'y avoit rien de premedité, et decharge les huguenots de l'accusation de l'entreprise a eux imputée. Mémoires, tom. 27. p. 274.

attempt made against the single life of the admiral? How came the conspirators to adopt a measure, the success of which must in all probability render the execution of their supposed design impracticable? To this objection he offers a first solution, which he rejects; then a second, which he likewise rejects; and, lastly, a third, which he adopts. "One other conjecture," he says, "remains; that the king, though originally a party in the conspiracy, had vacillated before the moment arrived for its execution; that the queen-mother, alarmed at the apparent progress Coligny was making in the confidence of her son, contrived the attempt on his life in the manner described by the duke of Anjou; and having failed in the enterprize, that partly by fear, and partly by insinuation, she brought back the king to his original design of dispatching the admiral and other huguenot chiefs, and making such a slaughter of the party, as to disable them from any future resistance to his will."³⁰

Remarks on this solution. On this, which after all is only a conjecture, I may offer a few remarks. 1. Instead of "apparent," the true reading will be "real progress of the admiral in the confidence of the king." For it must have been a real progress, which induced him to abandon the favourite object of his policy for so long a time. Now when did this change in the royal affection and projects take place? Evidently two months at least before the St. Bartholomew, as appears from the anxiety of Anjou and Tavannes to withdraw the king from his connection with the admiral. But what then be-

comes of the dissimulation and duplicity attributed to Charles in his communication with that nobleman, and of the insidious design with which he is supposed to have married his sister to the king of Navarre, that he might have a pretext for enveloping the whole body of the huguenots in one common massacre?

2. May not this change be dated even in the preceding year? The same marks of confidence were given by the king to the admiral during his visits in 1571, as in the last visit of 1572: and even then, according to Tavannes, Charles had been brought over to the interest of the party. *Il estoit entierement à eux.*³¹

3. It is moreover admitted, that not only the king, but the queen-mother vacillated also. Aware that she could not accomplish the design without the king's consent, and despairing of that consent on account of the progress which the admiral had

³¹ Tavannes, Mémoires, tom. 27, p. 214. To detract from the credit of this writer, who repeatedly asserts that the massacre was not premeditated, and accuses those who think so, of ignorance (xxvii. 215, 222; 241, 274), the reviewer tells us that "he was anxious to exculpate his father from the imputation of having been the deviser of a measure held in execration by all mankind." Rev. 148. Now the truth is, that Tavannes was anxious to secure to his father the glory of having been the deviser of the measure. *C'est la verité, que les huguenots furent seule cause de leurs massacres, mettans le roy en necessité de la guerre d'Espagne, ou de la leur. Sa majesté par le conseil du sieur de Tavannes esleut la moins dommageable, et salutaire tant pour la religion catholique, que pour l'estat. . . . Que l'on rend donc l'honneur a ceux qu'il appartient, non que ces grands meurtres soyent louables, mais bien d'avoir empesché que par les mariages et alliances les trois parts de l'Europe ne fussent du party heretique, et d'avoir destourné de la France une guerre très périlleuse. Mém. xxvii. 503. 504.*

made in his affection, she abandoned the intended massacre altogether ; and satisfying herself with the murder of one instead of many, endeavoured to remove by assassination the man, whom she considered as her rival and adversary. Thus, then, as far as regarded her and her party, it must also be acknowledged that the subsequent tragedy was the result of consequences.

4. It appears, therefore, that the difference of opinion between the reviewer and myself is not so great as might be imagined. We both agree that the attempt on the admiral is irreconcilable with the co-existence of a plan of general massacre, and that, the second was taken up afterwards, on account of the failure of the first : in this only we differ, that he considers the massacre as the revival of an abandoned plot, I as the effect of an entirely new design. But on what does he found his opinion? On the authority of the writers, to whom he has appealed in the preceding pages? Most certainly not. They never dreamed of any discontinuance of the supposed project. According to them it originated in the conferences at Bayonne: the pacification of 1570 was concluded to gain time to mature it ; and from that period to its execution, every measure taken by the court was artfully contrived to produce the desired result. Now, if in this, the most important part of their story, their evidence is rejected by the reviewer, why is it to be admitted in the other? If it be not of sufficient authority to prove the uninterrupted progress, why should it establish the previous existence, of the conspiracy?

Here he ought to have concluded the article : but

it suddenly occurred to him to revert to a subject which he had already treated, and to add "some traits of perfidy exhibited by the king in the interval between the final arrangement and the commencement of the tragedy." Of these the principal is thus described. "On the day before the massacre, Charles appointed a detachment of his guards for the protection of Coligny, stationed them around his lodgings, and ordered them to permit no catholic to approach the house; and on pretence of affording further security to the admiral, he directed that all the houses in the neighbourhood should be abandoned by their catholic tenants, and occupied by huguenots, who were ordered, by public authority, to repair to that quarter from the different parts of the town where they resided. The guards thus stationed for the protection of Coligny were employed next morning to murder him, and his friends, collected within a small space, were slaughtered without the possibility of concealment or escape."³²

For this story the reviewer refers to de Thou, but at the same time, (to use his favourite language) he suppresses an important circumstance related by de Thou, which will impart a very different colour to the whole transaction.³³ The measure did not originate with Charles, but with the admiral himself. The guards were sent at his express request; Cornaton

³² Rev. 155.

³³ Cum Colinius et ejus jussu Cornatonus sociorum nomine petiisset a rege et Andino fratre, præsidium aliquot armatorum tuendis Colinii ædibus circumponerent. Thuan. iii. 125. Nor does de Thou say that the protestants were *ordered*, but invited to take up lodgings near the house—singulos hortari, *ibid*, 126.

demanded them of the king in the name of Coligny: he even did more, he solicited from the king an order that all the houses in the street should be given up by their tenants for the accommodation of the admiral's friends, who wished to be lodged near him, for his greater protection. Of this we are assured by a writer, well known to the reviewer, and a most violent enemy of the king. Parquoi l'on donna charge à Cornaton d'aller vers le roy pour l'avertir de l'esmotion du peuple, et luy demander qu'il luy pleust ottroyer quelques archers de sa garde pour demeurer à l'entrée du logis de l'amiral: qu'il luy pleust aussi permettre, suivant le desir que plusieurs seigneurs et gentils-hommes, amis de l'amiral avoyent de se loger pres de luy, accorder et comander à son mareschal de corps, que la rue, ou l'amiral estoit logé, leur fust donné."³⁴

Again, it is of importance to determine at what time of the day, the request was made by Cornaton, and granted by the king. For, if this took place, before the design of the massacre was communicated to the latter, there can be no pretext for charging him with dissimulation. Now of the time there can be no doubt. De Thou adds, that afterwards a second council was held in Cornaton's chamber, and that a person who was present, treacherously hastened to the Louvre, and betrayed the proceedings to the king, who was walking with his counselors in the garden. All the authorities which mention this circumstance, agree that this took place after dinner, and that the proposal of the massacre was

³⁴ Mémoires de l'estat, i, 281. He complains afterwards that more guards were sent than Cornaton wished for.

then made to Charles. The same is also plain from the *Mémoires de l'estat*, from which we learn, that some hours elapsed before the guard arrived under the command of Cosseins, that soon afterwards Rambouillet ordered the catholic inhabitants of the street to leave it, and that he then marked the several houses for the friends of the admiral, who took possession. All these particulars show that Cornaton asked for guards in an early part of the day.³⁵ What then, I may ask, could induce the reviewer to bring this charge against the king; to attribute to him measures, which originated with the opposite party; and to accuse him of issuing orders for the purpose of facilitating the massacre, though they were issued at a time, when Charles could have no knowledge of any such design?

Testimony of Chateaubriand. He concludes the article by producing in favour of his opinion, a passage from a dissertation by Pere Griffet. To it I may be allowed to oppose an extract from *Les melanges literaires* of the viscount de Chateaubriand, which fully confirms the principal statements in the preceding pages. He had the curiosity to search for the history of the St. Bartholomew, where, if any where, the truth was to be discovered, in the archives of the Vatican, at the time when they were lodged in France during the reign of Napoleon. The several secret dispatches, written in cipher, and forwarded to Rome by the papal agents in Paris, were carefully examined, and the result of the inquiry proved most satisfactorily, that the St. Bartholomew had not been concerted beforehand,

³⁵ Thuan. iii. 126. *Mém. de l'estat*. i. 282.

that it was the sudden consequence of the wounds received by the admiral, and that the number of the slain, though undoubtedly great, was much below the computation adopted by certain writers. “ Si l’abbé de Caveyrac soutient que la journée de la Saint Barthelemy fut moins sanglante qu’on ne l’a cru, c’est qu’ hereusement ce fait est prouvé. Lorsque la Bibliothèque du Vatican étoit à Paris (trésor inapreciable auquel presque personne ne songeoit) j’ai fait faire des recherches ; j’ai trouvé sur la journée de la Saint Barthelemy les documens les plus précieux. Si la verité doit se rencontrer quelque part, c’est sans doute dans des lettres écrites en chiffres aux souverains Pontifes, et qui étoient condamnées à un secret eternel. Il resulte positivement de ces lettres que la Saint Barthelemy ne fut pas préméditée, qu’elle ne fut que la consequence soudaine de la blessure de l’amiral, et qu’elle n’enveloppa qu’un nombre de victimes, toujours beaucoup trop grand sans doute, mais au dessous des supputations de quelques historiens.³⁶

With this testimony I shall close my answer. As far as regards the historical question in dispute, there can, I think, remain no doubt, that the opinion which I adopted, was the only one probable in itself, and supported by real authority. If this be so, I am satisfied : the cavils of the reviewer, with his vituperative and vindictive language, may be given to the winds.

Tradam protervis in mare Creticum
Portare ventis.

³⁶ Œuvres Completttes de M. Le Viscomte de Chateaubriand, Paris, chez l’Avocat, 1826. Tom.xxi. p. 352.

CHAPTER III.

Mr. Todd's twelve objections—Cranmer's elevation to the See of Canterbury—His protestation—His letter for permission to examine the cause of the divorce—Henry's private marriage with Anne Boleyn—His supremacy—Cranmer's instrumentality in the condemnation of Lambert—His opinion respecting the eucharist—His opposition to the six articles—His condemnation of heretics to the flames—His declaration respecting the mass—The character of Gardiner—Cranmer's reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum—His recantations and death.

My next adversary, next in importance, but prior in point of time, is Mr. Todd, who, both in octavo and duodecimo, has challenged me to the combat. *He* maintains that religious prejudice has rendered me unjust to the merits of archbishop Cranmer; *I* suspect that religious partiality has rendered him blind to the frailties of his hero. If I know myself, I neither feel nor felt any antipathy to the memory of that prelate. But it was my endeavour and my duty to delineate his character with fidelity, to represent him as he really was, not as his admirers

may wish him to have been. Whether I have succeeded or not, my replies to the twelve charges or objections of Mr. Todd, will probably decide.

The first objection. “The elevation of Cranmer to the See of Canterbury is thus described by Dr. Lingard. ‘I know not why Burnet is so anxious to persuade his readers that Cranmer was unwilling to accept the archbishopric, and found means to delay the matter six months. There were few instances of the see of Canterbury being filled so soon after a vacancy.¹ Six months, indeed, elapsed before his consecration, but that arose from the negotiation with Rome to procure his bulls. He must have given his consent at least three months before.’ Lingard, 2nd edit. vi. 253, 254.” “Now,” proceeds Mr. Todd, “ought not Dr. Lingard here to have given Cranmer’s own account of his declining the archbishopric. And is not Burnet right in believing the solemn asseveration of the primate, made in the presence of his enemies? ‘I protest before you all,’ said Cranmer, ‘there never was a man came more unwilling to a bishopric than I did to that; insomuch that when king Henry did send for me in post that I should come over, I prolonged my journey by seven weeks at the least, thinking

¹ Mr. Todd objects to this passage; and I must own that it is stated too broadly. I should have excluded cases of translation. But he will pardon the inaccuracy, when he reflects that he has fallen into a similar error. He asserts that “the predecessors of Cranmer, for more than a century at least, were not thus impeded” that is, took possession of their sees within a shorter space than six months; and forgets that Wareham, his immediate predecessor, translated from London, did not succeed till about a year after the death of archbishop Dene. That prelate died the 16th Feb. 1503, and the bulls for Wareham were dated Nov. 29: he took the oath on the 23d of Jan. 1504, and was enthroned on the 9th of March.

that he would be forgetful of me in the meantime.' ”²

1. Here I may be allowed to ask, why Mr. Todd represents the passage which he has quoted, as my “description of Cranmer’s elevation to the see of Canterbury.” I have indeed described his elevation to the archbishopric in the two pages, 253, 254 : but the passage in question is no part of that description. It is merely a portion of a note subjoined to the text, for the purpose of pointing out the ingenuity of Burnet, who, to the time which elapsed from Cranmer’s receipt of the king’s letter in Germany to his acceptance of the archbishopric, added the three months which intervened between that acceptance and his consecration.³

2. If I rightly understand the reasoning of Mr. Todd, it follows that, because Cranmer said that “he came unwillingly to the bishopric,” he therefore “declined it:” and that, because he “prolonged his journey by seven weeks,” Burnet was right in saying that he delayed his consent for six months. By what argumentative process these two conclusions are deduced from the premises, I cannot comprehend.

3. To proceed to the criminal omission with which I am charged—I answer, that, if I had been writing the life of the archbishop, I should certainly have noticed this solemn asseveration, as it is termed ; but at the same time should have thought it a duty

² Todd, 38. I should observe that Mr. Todd, as well as my two other opponents, quotes from the 2nd edition in octavo.

³ He was “preconized” in the consistory in January (Becchetti, viii. 234.) and of course must have signified his consent at the latest in December.

to investigate two questions intimately connected with it: namely, whether more credit be due to the assertion of Cranmer in defence of himself before the commissioner, or to the contradictory assertion of Pole in his expostulatory letter to him; and then, whether his hesitation to return to England arose, as some pretend, from the moderation of his character, which aspired not to ecclesiastical honours, or, as others maintain, from certain misgivings, which taught him to fear the consequences of his late illegal marriage in Germany. But I was not his biographer; nor did I see the necessity of introducing into my pages the discussion of questions, which could throw no light on the general history of the times. This was my motive for the omission; a motive which, I trust, will be honoured with the approbation of the reader.⁴

Charge the Second. Mr. Todd, in the next place, selects the following passage: "By what casuistry could the archbishop elect, who was well acquainted with the services expected from him, reconcile it with his conscience to swear obedience to the pope, when he was already resolved to act in opposition to the papal authority? With the royal approbation, he called four witnesses into Saint Stephen's

⁴ I do not notice the strictures of Mr. Todd on Dr. Milner and Mr. Butler, which he frequently mixes up with his animadversions on my work. Of these two writers the first can make no defence: death has removed him from the petty quarrels which agitate the inhabitants of this earth. The latter, though seventy-seven winters have passed over his head, still wields the pen with the energy of youth. He has replied, and, as far as I can judge, most satisfactorily replied to Mr. Todd, in his "letters to Charles Blundell, Esq."

chapel at Westminster, and in their presence declared that by the oath of obedience to the pope, which for the sake of form he was obliged to take, he did not intend to bind himself to any thing contrary to the law of God, or prejudicial to the rights of the king, or prohibitory of such reforms, as he might judge useful to the church of England." Hist. vi. 254.—On this passage Mr. Todd comments through the six following pages, for the purpose of shewing that the protestation was made openly and publicly, and was not a "*secret protest*, as Dr. Lingard calls it."⁵

1. I am sure that my reverend adversary has no intention to misrepresent: but neither the offensive words "*secret protest*," nor any others of similar import, are to be found in my pages. However, I take blame to myself for the omission. I ought to have stated my opinion, which is, that the protestation was made in private, and that its purport was carefully concealed from the knowledge of the public. Otherwise the news would quickly have reached Rome; the archbishop would have been suspended from the exercise of his office, and his judgment in the great cause of the divorce would have been liable to the same objection, as if he had,

⁵ Todd, 41—49. Here I may observe that the imagination of Mr. Todd seems to be haunted by the ghost of Phillips, the writer of the life of cardinal Pole. On almost every charge he compares my narrative with that of Phillips. It matters not whether we agree or disagree: the bare mention of the name is sufficient to awaken the anger of Mr. Todd; and at every turn the unfortunate biographer is lashed most unmercifully. (See Todd, p. 43, 47, 71, 80, 96, 111.) To me these philippics are highly amusing: for I cannot recollect that I consulted the life of Pole in any one of the instances brought forward by Mr. Todd.

in the first instance, been consecrated without the papal approbation. The motives which induced Henry to solicit that approbation, equally required that the protest should be kept secret.

2. Mr. Todd contends that it was not a private transaction, because it contains the following words: “in his scriptis *palam, publice et expresse* protestor.” But Mr. Butler has shewn that such is the usual language of these instruments, though subscribed with the greatest privacy.⁶

3. He tells us of “the refutation of the clandestinity by Fuller,” and of “the masterly vindications of the publicity by Neve and Ridley.” Now what is this “refutation by Fuller?” A mere assertion, unsupported by authority, that the protestation was made thrice, once in the chapter house, then before the consecration, and, lastly, at the reception of the pall! And what is “the masterly vindication of Neve?” A repetition of that assertion, supported by the pretended authority of Fuller, who produces none himself, and of Fox and Strype, neither of whom mentions the renewal of the protestation! With Ridley’s “vindication,” I am unacquainted: but of this I am sure, that, if he had produced any additional testimony, it would not have been suppressed by Mr. Todd.⁷

4. Allow me then to ask, where is the authority

⁶ Letter ii. to C. Blundell, Esq. cxviii.

⁷ See Fuller, 186. Neve, 510. The latter adds, that “instruments were made at Cranmer’s request, recording these repeated protestations.” This, were it true, would set the question at rest. But where are these pretended instruments? If Mr. Todd does not know, we may conclude that they do not now exist, and, as no one, I believe, ever heard of them before Neve, we may add, that they never did exist.

for these pretended iterations? There is none in the instrument itself. It professes to be made before Watkins the king's prothonotary, not the consecrating bishops. "*Coram vobis authentica persona.*"—There is none in the altercation between Cranmer and Martin, the commissioner. Though the repetition of the oath is distinctly mentioned, no hint is given by either that the protestation was made more than once.—There is none in Fox, or Parker, or Godwin, or, as far as I can discover, in any writer within the next eighty years after the transaction.⁸ Strype informs us that, "having withal his said protestation, Cranmer, before the aforesaid witnesses (those in whose presence he had made it in the chapter house) asserted and protested that he would read the schedule, and perform the oath therein contained under the said protestation, which, he said, he made the same day in the chapter house before those witnesses, and no otherwise, nor in any other manner. And then presently after, kneeling on his knees, read the schedule containing the oath to the pope."⁹ Where Strype learned these particulars, or whether they are true or not, we are unable to discover: but it is evident that even, according to his narrative, the protestation was not repeated. All that Cranmer did, was to say before the four witnesses, that he meant to take the oath in the sense of the protestation, which

* Parker speaks of only one protestation. He says, indeed, that it was made in sacratione, but it is plain that he means the protestation privately made in the chapter house, as it was made *coram testibus fide dignis, notariisque publicis*. Mason is the first with whom I am acquainted, who mentions repeated protestations, (*De Minist. Angl.* 154.) but he produces no authority.

⁹ Strype's Cranmer, p. 20. App. p. 9.

he had already made in their presence. Its purport was still kept secret.

5. "Even the jurist, Dr. Martin, the enemy of Cranmer," says Mr. Todd, "is opposed to the secret protest."¹⁰ But where, I ask, is the proof? In the following dialogue.

"*Martin.* Did you not swear obedience to the see of Rome?

"*Cranmer.* Indeed I did once swear unto the same.

"*Martin.* Yea, that you did twice, as appeareth by records and writings here ready to be shewn.

"*Cranmer.* But I remember that I saved all by protestation that I made by the counsel of the best learned men I could get at that time."¹¹

Mr. Todd occasionally soars beyond the ken of ordinary understandings. Here he infers that Martin believed the protest to have been public, because he said that Cranmer had twice sworn obedience to the see of Rome, as appeared by records and writings. How is this conclusion drawn? I know not. I can see the two extremes, but the chain which connects them together, is lost in impenetrable darkness.

6. However, with regard to the morality of the fact, it matters little, whether it were done in private or in public. In either case it was a secret to him, to whom the oath was taken, and by whom it was imposed. He had empowered no one to receive it with any limitation. He had issued the bulls for the archbishop elect on the express condition that he

¹⁰ Todd, 45.

¹¹ Fox, Acts and mon. Wordsworth's eccles. biog. iii. 546.

should take the oath in the usual manner previously to the episcopal consecration. Undoubtedly, as far as regarded the pontiff, the protest was a fraud.¹²

Charge the Third. The third passage which calls forth the reprehension of Mr. Todd, refers to a letter from the new archbishop to his sovereign. "As soon as the convocation had separated, a hypocritical farce was enacted between Henry and Cranmer. The latter wrote a most urgent letter to the king, representing the evils, to which the nation was exposed from a disputed succession, and begging, for the exoneration of his own conscience, and the performance of his duty to the country, the royal license to examine and determine the great cause of the divorce. The king readily granted the request." Hist. vi. 256.

1. To this passage Mr. Todd opposes the entire letter of Cranmer: not that he objects to the accuracy of my statement, but to shew that the transaction does not deserve the imputation of being a "hypocritical farce."¹³ Loath as I am to offend the feelings of my adversary, I cannot consent to withdraw the expression. He boasts of the humility and piety observable in the letter. There is, indeed, humility enough, for the archbishop knew the disposition of the tyrant, whom he addressed: of piety I see but little, nor did the subject require much. But the true point at issue between us is, whether the conscientious motives, alleged by Cranmer, were real or pretended. To decide this, we

¹² Quod juramentum, nisi in sacratione præstaret, tam episcopis sacroribus, quam ipsi sacrato omni episcopali administrationi interdixit. Parker, Antiquit. 490.

¹³ Todd, 50.

must look at the facts. Henry had failed in all his attempts to obtain a divorce from his wife. Fortunately archbishop Wareham dies, and the king, instead of translating some prelate to the vacant see, as had been the practice for the last hundred and fifty years, pitches upon a clergyman in priest's orders, a dependent on the family of his mistress. By the time his bulls arrive, she is several months gone with child: no moment is to be lost. In a few days, the new archbishop is consecrated, and within less than a fortnight, even before he obtains possession of his temporalities, he asks permission to hear and determine the cause of the divorce. Can any man, who bears these facts in mind, believe that Cranmer was ignorant of the object, for which he was placed in the see of Canterbury? That he intruded himself into this difficult and odious business, merely for the exoneration of his conscience? or that he sought to determine the cause for any other reason than because he knew it was expected from him? The true motive of his haste may be seen in another letter also published by Mr. Todd, in which, having pronounced the divorce, he wishes to proceed with the proof of the second marriage, "for the time of the coronation is so instaunte, and so nere at hand, that the matter requireth good expedition to be had in the same."¹⁴

¹⁴ Todd, 59. In p. 56, he asks "why, as *the business of the divorce* is called a hypocritical farce, is not Gardiner also said to have enacted a part in it." I am surprised Mr. Todd did not observe that the expression is not applied to *the business of the divorce*, but to the correspondence between Cranmer and the king, in which Gardiner had no concern.—As to the part which Gardiner acted in the *business of the divorce*, I have stated that he acted "with seven others as counsel for the king." Hist. vi. 527.

2. Mr. Todd persuades himself that every candid reader of the letter, "will be led to believe the assertion of one of Cranmer's biographers, that his being placed in this cause of the divorce at the head of the commissioners shocked the archbishop."¹⁵ This is passing strange! The object of the letter, as is evident both from itself, and from the king's answer, was to obtain permission to determine the cause according to the duty of his office, and yet we are called upon to believe that he was shocked, when his request was granted! If it were so, there certainly must have been more dissembling in the transaction, than I before suspected.—But why are we told of his being "at the head of the commissioners?" He was the sole judge, he heard the cause in his own court, and he pronounced judgment by his own authority as archbishop.¹⁶

3. We are referred in the next place to the passage, in which I state that Henry was secretly married to Anne Boleyn on the 25th of January, in a garret at the western end of Whitehall. Mr. Todd will not believe that the king of England "would condescend to celebrate his marriage in a garret," nor is he the only critic whose ire has kindled at this unfortunate expression. The king's object was certainly to conceal the ceremony from the prying eyes of his household; and what he would do, or would not do for that purpose, is more, I believe,

¹⁵ Todd, 53. The biographer is Gilpin.

¹⁶ *In causa, quæ coram nobis in iudicio ex officio nostro mero veritur . . . de consilio jurisperitorum et theologorum cum quibus in hac parte communicavimus, ad sententiam nostram definitivam in dicta causa ferendam procedimus . . . pronunciamus, decernimus et declaramus, &c. . . Rym. xiv. 463.*

than Mr. Todd can inform us. However, I have no predilection for the word “garret:” any other of similar meaning will equally serve my purpose. Shall I substitute “a room in the attic story?” This may be thought a more attic phrase, and therefore more befitting the dignity of the subject. Or will “a room in the western turret,” be preferred? It was certainly at the very top of the house, “editissima,” and rose above the western end, “quæ parti occidentali supereminet.” On a subject of this immense importance, I shall be most ready to adopt any emendation, which may be thought the least degrading to the majesty of the English monarch.

The Fourth Charge. Mr. Todd’s objections, under the head of the king’s supremacy, are of such a nature, that I know not what answer to return. He inquires why I have asserted this thing, why I have omitted that? and attributes both assertions and omissions to motives, which never had existence, except in his own imagination. To refute such trifling, would be to insult the discernment of the reader: and I feel that an apology is due for the brief notice which I mean to take of the most prominent passages.

1. I am charged with suppressing the fact that Gardiner wrote a book in defence of the king’s supremacy. Now this is plainly intimated in the passage quoted by Mr. Todd,¹⁸ and is expressly stated in pages 426 and 482 of my sixth volume.

¹⁸ “Henry called on the most loyal and learned of the prelates to employ their talents in support of his new dignity; and the call was obeyed by Sampson and Stokesley, Tunstal and Gardiner.” *Hist.* vi. 284.

2. I had said that Tunstal's compliance was thought to arise from the fear of the royal displeasure: to which Mr. Todd opposes a letter written by that prelate to Henry, and at the same time twitts me with want of research, otherwise I could not have been ignorant of its existence. I can assure him that I was well acquainted with the letter, though I drew from it an inference greatly at variance with his opinion. It most certainly proves in my favour that Henry himself did not believe the bishop, who had previously protested against his supremacy,¹⁹ to be a sincere convert to the cause: nor will the denial of Tunstal be sufficient to remove the suspicion, if we recollect that it was made under the fear of bringing on himself the vengeance of a despotic sovereign.²⁰

3. When I noticed Cranmer's sermon to prove that the pope was antichrist, I observed that "a new light had lately burst on the archbishop." Mr. Todd denies it; because as much had been said by others before him. That is true, but I spoke with reference to Cranmer's previous conduct. But a little before, in the judgments by which he dissolved the marriage of Henry and Catharine, and confirmed the marriage of Henry and Anne, he was careful to style himself the legate of the very man, whom now he branded with the title of antichrist.²¹ Might I

¹⁹ See his protestation in Wilkins, Con. iii. 757.

²⁰ Henry in his letter to Tunstal reproached him with "looking for a new world or mutation." He replied, "I have been as sore against such usurpations of the bishop of Rome as dayly did grow, as any man of my degree in this realme, and that I should now look for the renewing of that thing, which I withstood heretofore as far as I might, when he flourished most, it is not likely." Strype, Eccl. Memorials, i. App. 138.

²¹ Rymer, xiv. 462. 469.

not then say with every appearance of truth, that a new light had burst upon his mind ?

The Fifth Charge. Speaking of the prosecution of Lambert for heresy, I said, "Nor is it the least remarkable circumstance in his story, that of the three men who brought him to the stake, Taylor, Barnes, and Cranmer, two professed, perhaps even then, most certainly later, the very same doctrine as their victim, and all three suffered afterwards the same, or nearly the same, punishment." Hist. vi. 367. In contradiction to this statement, Mr. Todd asserts that I have not proved, nor even pretended to prove, that Cranmer brought Lambert to the stake. Let the reader judge from the following words. "Urged by an unconquerable passion for controversy, Lambert presented to Dr. Taylor a written paper, containing eight reasons against the belief of the real presence. Taylor consulted Barnes : Barnes disclosed the matter to Cranmer ; and Cranmer summoned the schoolmaster (Lambert) to answer for his presumption in the archiepiscopal court." Now it was this which led to his condemnation ; and, as I speak of Taylor, Barnes, and Cranmer in the same manner, it is evident that I consider them all three as instrumental in bringing the victim to the stake. Had not Taylor communicated the paper to Barnes, or had not Barnes denounced Lambert to Cranmer, or had not Cranmer summoned him to answer for his heresy, the unhappy man would not have forfeited his life. The fact is so plain, that I see not how it can admit a doubt.

But was not Cranmer still more instrumental in the accomplishment of this tragedy than I have

asserted in my work? Lambert was first tried before him, and appealed from him to the king. I will not pretend that he was actually condemned by the archbishop, because the proceedings have been lost; but it is not very probable that he would appeal from him, till he saw that an unfavourable judgment would be pronounced. Before Henry it is admitted that Cranmer disputed against him; and, if we may believe an authority quoted in the course of a few pages by Mr. Todd, he did more: he condemned him. "What doctrine," says Martin to the archbishop, "taught you, when you *condemned* Lambert, the sacramentary, in the king's presence in Whitehall?" Now does Cranmer deny that he condemned him? No: he silently acquiesces in the charge, replying: "I maintained *then* the papist's doctrine."²² Judgment we know was pronounced by Cromwell, the king's vicar general, but from this passage it is probable that the seven bishops present, of whom Cranmer was the chief, sate as judges on the bench with Cromwell.

Charge the Sixth. In a note at p. 368, I have said: "Cranmer's promptitude to reject the doctrine of the real presence, when he could do it with safety, has provoked a suspicion that he did not sincerely believe it before. Burnet and Strype conceive that he held the Lutheran tenet of consubstantiation at this period: and I am inclined to assent to them from the tenor of the two letters already quoted, that to Hawkins, and the other to Vadianus."

Certainly Mr. Todd's taste must be very capri-

²² Todd 79, 80.

cious. If I differ from Strype and Burnet, he is displeased: now, that I am inclined to agree with them, he is equally displeased. He is positive that at this period Cranmer held the catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. For, as we have just seen, when Martin asked, what doctrine *taught* you, when you condemned Lambert? Cranmer replied “I *maintained* then the papists’ doctrine. Again Martin said: “You, Master Cranmer, have *taught* in this high sacrament of the altar three contrary doctrines, and yet you pretended in every one *verbum domini*.” “Nay,” replied the archbishop, “I *taught* but two contrary doctrines in the same.” But Mr. Todd, whose eye is so experienced in the detection of verbal niceties, should have observed, that these questions and answers refer to the doctrine which Cranmer openly *taught*, and that we are inquiring into the doctrine which he inwardly *believed*. That he *taught* at this period the doctrine of transubstantiation, is well known. Had he not, the infallibility of the head of the church would have condemned him to the stake. But Strype and Burnet think that he really held the Lutheran tenet of consubstantiation. As far as I can judge, they think rightly.²³

²³ Mr. Todd has here published a fragment of a letter to Cranmer from Dantiscus in 1540, not that it refers to the present subject, but because “it is too curious to be omitted.” Quodque magis hic omnes in admiracionem ac detestacionem inducit, *tot conjugia, totque contra omnes cum humanas tum etiam divinas leges repudia*, quæ tamen, quamvis passim hic in vulgus sparsa pro veris habentur, apud me adhuc sunt ambigua. “Here,” says Mr. Todd, “is an evident allusion to the frequency of divorces, which at that time prevailed.” But it alludes to frequency of marriages as well as of divorces, and in reality refers, not to the manners of the age, but to the conduct of the king; who had not only married and divorced

The Seventh Charge. The conduct of the archbishop, with respect to the statute of the six articles, has been highly eulogized by his admirers; who have described him as persisting in his opposition to the very last, and braving the displeasure of the king in the cause of humanity and truth. 1. It should, however, be considered, that his opposition was not entirely disinterested. The third of the articles declared that priests may not marry by the word of God: the statute itself pronounced such marriages of no effect; ordered the parties so married to be separated; made it felony, if they should cohabit afterwards, and subjected all persons in priests' orders, who lived carnally with women, to imprisonment and forfeiture on the first conviction, and to death on the second. Now, Cranmer was in priests' orders; he had married a relation of Osiander in Germany; he still cohabited with her at Canterbury; he had a family by her. Had he not, then, the strongest personal motives to oppose these severe and sanguinary enactments? 2. It is not true that his opposition was continued to the very last. It ceased on the second day. On the first the archbishop, and several other prelates, spoke with energy and resolution, but the next morning the house was honoured with the presence of Henry: the royal theologian supported the articles with irresistible eloquence, and Cranmer came over to the opinion

Catharine of Arragon, and Anne Boleyn, but that very year had married and divorced Anne of Cleves, and taken another wife, Catharine Howard. The passage is underlined: and Cranmer himself says that he had underlined such passages as contained "haynous rumours of the kyng's majestie." See Mr. Todd's Vindication, 83—85.

of the head of the church. That this was the case, is proved by the following letter, written at the time by one of the lords, who was present.

“ Notwithstanding my lord of Canterbury, my lord of Ely, my lord of Salisbury, my lords of Worcester, Rochester, and St. Davyes, defended the contrary a long time, yet finally his highness confounded them all with godlie learning. York, Durham, Winchester, London, Chichester, Norwich and Carlisle, have shewed themselves honest and well learned men. We of the temporalty have been all of one opinion: and my lord chancellor and lord privy seal (Audeley and Cromwell,) as good as we can devise. My lord of Canterbury, and all his bishops have given their opinions, and have come in to us, save Salisbury, who yet continueth a lewd fool.” Cleop. E. v. p. 128.

On this letter Mr. Todd makes the following remarks. 1. “ Dr. Lingard has not noticed that this letter was copied from the manuscript by the accurate Strype, and printed by him in the appendix to his life of Cranmer.”²⁴ Had Mr. Todd compared the two copies, he might have spared this remark. Strype’s copy is very inaccurate: mine is correct, and taken, not from that of Strype, but from the original in the British Museum.²⁵

2. “ The letter is without any name subscribed, which also Dr. Lingard has suppressed.”²⁶ I answer that it is only a fragment, which has been preserved.

²⁴ Todd, 87.

²⁵ I did not, indeed, preserve the orthography of the original, which I regret. The word *goodlie* is a typographical error for *godlie*.

²⁶ Todd, 87.

Had I known the name of the writer, I should certainly have given it. The omission must have announced to my readers that the writer was unknown.

3. "It may have been the exaggerated communication of any friend to the papal cause in the way of news, as indeed it seems to be, for it begins—*and also neues here.*"²⁷ It is said that a sinking man will catch at a straw: and so it appears to be with Mr. Todd. Let the reader peruse the letter once more, and say whether it be possible to believe that the writer was not one of the temporal lords. "We of the temporalty have been all of one opinion: my lord of Canterbury and all his bishops have given their opinions, and have come in to *us.*"

4. "The letter affirms what is not true, that the bishop of Salisbury alone persisted in refusing his assent, and that the archbishop of Canterbury, with the bishops who have been already named of his opinion, came in to the opposing party, when the bishop of Worcester, as well as the bishop of Salisbury, rather than conform, resigned his bishopric."²⁸ With all my respect for Mr. Todd, I must be allowed to doubt whether he be as well acquainted with the transactions of that day, as the writer of the letter. To the assertion that the bishop of Salisbury alone persisted in refusing his assent, Mr. Todd opposes his own persuasion that the bishop of Worcester did the same. But how does he prove it? Because they both resigned their bishoprics. That they resigned, is true; but then comes the important question, when did they resign? Had it been

²⁷ Todd, 87.

²⁸ Ibid. 88

at the close of the debate, or even soon afterwards, that circumstance might have furnished a presumption in Mr. Todd's favour. But it appears, from the journals of the house of lords, that both prelates continued to sit and vote till the end of the session. For what reason they resigned, or were forced to resign afterwards, we do not exactly know. It might be on account of their intemperance during the debate : or it might be on account of their unwillingness to inquire into the new offences created by the act, a task which was imposed on the bishops.²⁹

But "Cranmer," says Mr. Todd, "protested against the bill." "The king desired him to go out of the house, since he could not give his consent to the bill; but he humbly excused himself: for he thought he was in conscience bound to stay and vote against it,"³⁰ Of this protest and vote no trace can be discovered in the journals; nor do I admire the judgment of the man who thus prefers the statement of a professed partisan, made one hundred and fifty years afterwards (it is Burnet's statement,) to that of one who wrote at the very time, and was present at the debate.

It has always appeared to me that the advocates of the archbishop confound the debate on the articles, with the passing of the bill. The articles were

²⁹ Mr. Todd has copied my note on their resignation, but only as far as the words of the French ambassador. His letter was written after the prorogation of the parliament, and gives as the cause of their deprivation, that they would not subscribe to the edicts: *pour n'avoir voulu souscrire à edits*. What the Frenchman meant by edicts, it is not easy to ascertain; perhaps the king's injunctions for the execution of the act.

³⁰ Todd, 91.

proposed on the sixteenth of May : afterwards came the recess : the two houses met again on the 30th ; and the bill was introduced on the 7th of June. It was before the recess that the great debate took place, at which the king attended : on the 30th, after the recess, the lord chancellor informed the house, that by the conjoined labours of the king and the prelates, unanimity had been effected respecting the articles. Thus at least I understand the words in the journal : *per dominum cancellarium declaratum est, quod, cum non solum procures spirituales, verum etiam regia majestas ad unionem in præcedentibus articulis conficiendam multipliciter studuerunt et laboraverunt, ita ut nunc unio in eisdem confecta sit, regię igitur voluntatis esse ut pœnale aliquod statutum efficeretur.*³¹ This passage appears to me to shew that not only the archbishop, but all the bishops, even Salisbury himself, had “ come in to ” the royal opinion.

Mr. Todd asks, “ can Dr. Lingard call Cranmer a convert to a cause which he waited for the opportunity only again to oppose ? Of these very six articles the archbishop himself afterwards brought in a bill to mitigate the penalties.”³² I called him a convert, because “ he had given his opinion, and come in to ” the opposite party : that he was a sincere convert, I neither said nor thought. But does Mr. Todd really suppose, that to mitigate the penalties of dissent, is the same thing as to oppose the establishment of doctrine ? The very bill of mitigation, which was supported, perhaps introduced, by the archbishop four years afterwards, left the doctrine

³¹ Journals, I. 113.

³² Todd, 92.

of the six articles in full force, and established by law.

Eighth, Ninth, and Tenth Charges. In the eighth and ninth sections of Mr. Todd's vindication, I see nothing that particularly demands notice: the tenth begins in the following manner. "Among the many partialities of Dr. Lingard, none can be more revolting than his pretence, by way of contrast to the character of Cranmer, of an unpersecuting temper in Gardiner, and of a mild demeanour in Bonner."³³ Shall I escape the imputation of rudeness, if I say that the first part of this charge is ridiculous? In which of my pages is this wonderful contrast to be found? I have spoken, indeed, of Cranmer, and Gardiner, and Bonner. It was my duty to speak of them, as their actions passed in review before me. But I never brought them into comparison with each other, nor did the idea so much as suggest itself to my mind. Of Bonner I have said little: but that little was taken from Mr. Todd's favourite authority, Fox. With respect to Gardiner, I had so often seen the epithet "bloody" attached to his name, that I looked on him as a most cruel persecutor; and, having repeatedly seen the mild and charitable Cranmer sitting on the trial, and pronouncing the condemnation of heretics in the reign of Edward, I expected to find the bloody Gardiner daily employed in similar atrocities during that of Mary. It, therefore, excited my surprise, when I could discover but one instance in which he had taken any part in such proceedings, and that was on the first prosecution after

³³ Todd, 104.

the revival of the statutes, when it was expected that he, as the chief law magistrate, should attend. On this account I ventured to remark, that "the charge against the chancellor was not supported by any authentic document, and was weakened by the general tenor of his conduct." The remark has astonished the prejudices of Mr. Todd: my readers, I trust, will think, that, with a due regard to truth, I could not have said less.

In a note I added the following passage from Persons, as corroborative of my opinion. "Verily I believe that, if a man should ask any good-natured protestant that lived in Queen Maries tyme, and hath both wit to judge, and indifferency to speak the truthe without passion, he will confesse that no one great man in that government was further off from blood and bloodiness, or from crueltie and revenge, than bishop Gardiner, who was known to be a most tender-hearted and myld man in that behalf; in so much that it was sometymes, and by some great personages, objected to him for no small fault, to be ever full of compassion in the office and charge that he bore: yea, to him especially it was imputed, that none of the greatest and most knowen protestants in Queen Maries reigne, were ever called to accompt, or put to trouble for religion."³⁴

It is not by abusing this writer that Mr. Todd must expect to put down this testimony. Let him, if he can, produce some instance that contradicts it. Let him remember that Persons wrote of the public conduct of one, who had exercised the office of prime minister, and wrote at a time, when thou-

³⁴ Persons, Ward-woorde, p. 42.

sands were alive to convict him of falsehood, if what he asserted, were not true. Let him compare the testimony of Persons, papist as he was, with the testimony of that sound orthodox protestant, old Roger Ascham, preceptor to queen Elizabeth, who thus writes, in the reign of that princess, to the earl of Leicester. “Noe bishop in queene Marye’s days wold have dealt so with me : for such estimac’on e’n those (even the learnedst and wisest men, as Gardiner, Heath, and cardinal Poole) made of my doore service, that although they knew perfectly, that in religion, by open writing and privy talk, I was contrary unto them, yett that, when Sir Francis Inglefield by name did note me specially at the council board, Gardiner would not suffer me to be called thither; nor touched elsewhere, saying such words of me as in a letter, though letters cannot blushe, yet should I blushe to write therein to your Lo’pp—Winchester’s good will stood not in speakeing faire, and wishing well, but he did indeed that for me, whereby my wife and children shall live the better, when I am gone.”³⁵

In the Eleventh Charge, we are directed to that passage in my history of Mary, in which I have brought to light the persecuting provisions of the *reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum*, the new code of canon law devised by the archbishop in the reign of Edward, for the government of the reformed church of England.³⁶ It was certainly an awkward discovery : and, when I consider the pain with which Mr. Todd seems to have perused it, I can readily

³⁵ Whitaker’s *Richmondshire*, 286. *Nugæ Antiquæ*, i. 99.

³⁶ *Hist.* vii. 258. Todd, 113.

excuse the remarks which it has drawn from his pen. Whether those remarks have done him honour in the estimation of his readers, I am ignorant: to me it is sufficient that he dare not deny the accuracy of my statement. I ask no more.

The Twelfth and Last Charge demands a few preliminary observations. Soon after the death of the archbishop, a book was published in London with this title: "All the submyssions and recantations of Thomas Cranmer, late archebyshop of Canturburye, truly set forth in Latyn and English, agreeable to the originalles wrytten and subscribed with his own hand: Visum et examinatum per reverendum patrem et dominum, Edmundum, Episcopum London. Anno MDLVI. Excusum Lond. in ædibus J. Cawodi, Typogr. Regiæ Majest. cum privilegio."

1. This book contains the submissions and recantations written and subscribed with the hand of the archbishop. In number they amount to *seven*. This, I trust, is a sufficient answer to the remark of Mr. Todd, that "to the six instruments of the archbishop's abjuration, published by Bonner, Dr. Lingard has for the first time in the page of history mistakenly added a *seventh*." 2. In Mary's reign as well as the reigns of her successors, no work, touching on theological matters, could be lawfully published without the previous examination and license of the archbishop, or of the bishop of London. This tract bears, in the title page, the license of Bonner. By most writers it has on that account been considered as his work and publication: but most certainly the ground of their opinion suggests the contrary. Had he been the author, it would not have stood in need of his

license. 3. It was published by Cawoode cum privilegio, that is, with a patent securing to him the copyright. Now it appears to me, that this single circumstance will furnish a more probable explanation of the two entries in the council book of 13th and 16th of March, than has yet been given. The first is an order that Rydall and Copland should give up the printed copies of Cranmer's recantation to be burnt: the second, a recognisance by the same printers, that they "will deliver to Mr. Cawoode all such books as they of late printed, concerning Cranmer's recantation, to be by the said Cawoode burnt." By the dates, it appears that these orders refer to the recantation of doctrinal errors made on the 25th of February. But at that time, as appears from the letter of the French ambassador, he was expected to make another recantation of erroneous conduct; and this he accordingly did make on the eighteenth of March. Hence, as the book of Rydall and Copland was evidently imperfect, we may conclude that it was published without license, which would subject it to seizure; and as it was moreover an infringement of Cawoode's copyright, the reason appears why the books were delivered to Cawoode himself to be destroyed.

2. But to proceed to the submissions themselves, the four first appear to have been considered as general and evasive: the fifth was as full and explicit, in regard to doctrine, as the most zealous of the archbishop's adversaries could have wished. In the sixth he condemned his own conduct, acknowledged that he had been a greater persecutor than St. Paul; that he was unworthy of favour: that he deserved not only temporal but

everlasting punishment. He was the cause and author of the divorce; he had blasphemed against the sacrament, and had sinned against heaven. He conjured the pope, the king, and the queen, to pardon his offences against them; the whole realm, and the universal church to have compassion on his wretched soul; and God to look on him with mercy at the hour of his death. Of the authenticity of these two confessions there can be no doubt. One is given by Fox, the other is mentioned by the French ambassador in a letter to his court, as "*une confession publique, et amende honorable et volontaire.*" Indeed they are not disputed by the friends of the archbishop, who confine themselves to the denial of the seventh, a matter of small consequence as far as regards the conduct of Cranmer; but considered by them of importance, in as much as it furnishes a plausible cause of invective against Bonner, "the egregious superintendant of the publication," says Mr. Todd, "who had the effrontery to publish to the world the very contrary of what Cranmer professed, as if it had been approved and pronounced by him:" "the profligate bishop," says Strype, "who, to serve an end, prostituted his faith and credit, by testifying a thing so notoriously known to be quite otherwise."³⁷

3. But a few moments of cool inquiry will show, that the publisher, whoever he was, committed no forgery: that he inserted in his book nothing but what was true, and that this fabrication, as it is termed, forms in reality, what I have called it, a seventh recantation. The book, it should be

³⁷ Todd, 125. Strype, iii. 233

recollected, professes to contain, not the speech which the archbishop made in the church before his death, but "the submissions and recantations which he wrote and subscribed." Did he then write and subscribe this seventh recantation? Of that there cannot be a doubt. "Then," says Fox, "because the day was not farr past, and the lords and knights that were looked for, were not yet come, there came to him the Spanish frier, witness of his recantation, bringing a paper with articles, which Cranmer should openly profess in his recantation before the people, earnestly desiring him that he would write the said instrument with the articles with his own hand, and sign it with his name, *which when he had done*, the said frier desired that he would write another copy thereof, which should remain with him, and *that he did also*."³⁸ If then Cranmer actually wrote and subscribed this recantation, where can be the forgery in publishing it as such with his other recantations? He afterwards revoked whatever he had subscribed: that I acknowledge: but the revocation did not do away the existence of his previous submissions, or make the publication of any of them a forgery.³⁹

The principal objection which Mr. Todd brings against me under this head is, that I have not noticed "the subtlety with which the fortitude of

³⁸ Acts and mon. 559.

³⁹ Here I have to thank Mr. Todd for the detection of a trifling error in my account of the last paper. I called the fourth article in it an assertion of the queen's title; I should have said a direction to assert it: for so unconscious was the publisher of the design now imputed to him, of imposing the paper on the public as a speech actually spoken, that he printed it with the directions which it contained. "Here to declare the quenes just title to the crown."

the archbishop had been assailed ;” “ the promise that his life should be spared, and the suggestion that he might live many years, and yet enjoy dignity or ease, or both.”⁴⁰ It is evident that Mr. Todd has overlooked the note in p. 278, of my sixth volume, in which I both mention these rumours, and refute them. Had such a promise been made, the archbishop would have mentioned it, when he revoked his recantations in his last speech : on the contrary, he attributed the recantations, not to any promise given, but to the hope cherished by himself, that by making them, he should obtain mercy. “ I renounce and refuse them,” says he, “ as things written with my hand, contrary to the truth which I thought in my heart ; and written for fear of death, and to save my life, if it might be.”⁴¹ From these words it is evident, that he had received no promise.

I have now gone through the twelve charges advanced against me by Mr. Todd. I have met them fairly, and answered them, I trust, satisfactorily. To me the controversy, though occasionally embittered by an angry expression from my opponent, has proved highly gratifying. The talents and industry of Mr. Todd are well known : the sources of information lay open before him : he possessed facilities of research, which fall not to the lot of many : and the result has been, I say it with confidence, that he has produced nothing to impeach, in any material degree, the correctness of my references, or the veracity of my statements.

⁴⁰ Todd, 117, 121. ⁴¹ Strype, iii. 237.

CHAPTER IV.

The Quarterly Review—Its compliment to Mr. Todd—The Amour between Henry and Anne Boleyn—Also between Henry and Mary Boleyn—Dispensation granted to Henry—Speeches of Anne in the Tower—Admonition of Cardinal Allen.

A writer in the fifty-sixth number of the *Quarterly Review*, mentions with distinguished praise "the severe and unrelenting vigilance, with which Mr. Todd has hunted Dr. Lingard through his many mis-statements respecting archbishop Cranmer."¹ But he is not content with paying this compliment, he aspires to a share in the honours of the chase; and undertakes to pursue me through the melancholy story of Henry's second queen, the unfortunate Anne Boleyn. Be it so: I have no great reason to fear these literary Nimrods. The reader has seen how easily I burst the gossamer nets of Mr. Todd: the toils spread by his brother huntsman are fabricated of the same light and flimsy materials.

Henry and Anne Boleyn. "Dr. Lingard," says the reviewer, "details the whole progress of the amour (between Henry and Anne) during five

¹ *Quart. Rev.* p. 19.

years, with the precision and accuracy of one of Marivaux' novels. His authorities for all this are a few dateless letters, and a furious invective by Henry's enemy, cardinal Pole. The finished coquette, who, coldly and with ambitious calculation, for two years, refused a less price than a crown for her affections, who, by consummate artifice, wrought the amorous monarch to divorce his wife and wed herself, is stated, nevertheless, to have lived as Henry's concubine during three years. Now, in the absence of all authentic evidence, would it not have been more natural, evidently more charitable, to attribute her long resistance to her virtuous principles, perhaps to her previous attachment to lord Percy? her weakness to the seductions of Henry's ardent attachment, and to her confidence in his promises. All that is proved against her in this part of her history is, that she was married on the 25th of January (in a garret as Dr. Lingard, with due regard to probability, asserts,) and that Elizabeth was born the 13th of September."²

1. In this laboured passage we look in vain for the perspicuity, which usually characterizes the writer. He is evidently at a loss, whether he ought to admit or to deny the alleged connexion between Henry and Anne. In one part he admits it, where he wishes her weakness to be attributed to the seductions of Henry, and her confidence in his promises: in others he may be said to deny it, for he affirms the absence of all authentic evidence, and that nothing has been proved against her but her marriage on the 25th of January, and the birth of

² Review, p. 13. The length of the passage has induced me to omit a few lines of no importance

her child on the 13th, he should have said the 7th of September.

2. I shall answer, that I have related nothing respecting the conduct of Henry and Anne, which is not founded, in my opinion, on evidence beyond cavil or suspicion. One letter, indeed, is dateless. But that letter is favourable to Anne, as it proves that Henry, when he wrote it, had in vain solicited her chastity for more than a twelvemonth. But, if the reviewer had consulted the other letters, which I have quoted, he could not have said that they are "dateless." All of them, and they are numerous, have their accompanying dates. As to the "furious invective" by cardinal Pole, it will be more properly noticed in the discussion of the next objection.

3. I shall add that there is no absence, as he pretends, of authentic evidence. We have not, indeed, the confession of the parties; but we possess the evidence of those, who had the opportunity of knowing the truth, and who gave their testimony in circumstances, in which they cannot be suspected of falsehood. We have the evidence of cardinal Wolsey. In a confidential conversation with Cavendish respecting the causes of his disgrace, he alludes to the secret and nocturnal influence of Anne, whom he points out by the designation of "the night-crowe, that cries ever in the king's ears against me."³ We have the letters of Du Bellay,

³ Wordsworth's Eccles. Biog. i. 490. Of this influence there had been lately a remarkable instance. Henry had received the cardinal graciously, conversed with him familiarly in presence of the courtiers, given him a long audience in his closet till late in the evening, and requested him to return the next day. His enemies

the French ambassador, the confidant of both Henry and Anne. His language, when he speaks of the lovers, is too plain to be misunderstood. There cannot be a question that he looked upon her as the king's mistress. We have the two breves of Clement addressed to Henry, in which the pontiff states the fact without doubt or qualification. But what is more in such a case, we have the evidence of facts. We find the king attempting to seduce a young and beautiful female. To overcome her objections, he promises her marriage, as soon as he can obtain a divorce from his wife. The cause is brought into court: but the delay of the judges irritates his impatience. He expels his wife; he sends for the object of his affection from the house of her father; he allots her apartments contiguous to his own; he orders his courtiers to pay to her all the respect due to the queen; he suffers her to interfere in matters of state, and to claim a share in the distribution of favours. Thus they live for three years under the same roof. We find them taking their meals together; if the king ride out, we are sure to discover her by his side; if he hunt, he places her in a convenient station to partake of the sport; if he change his residence, she accompanies him; and, when he crosses the sea to meet the French king at Calais, he cannot leave her behind him. Let the reader couple all this

trembled for their own safety; but before morning the "night-crowe had cried in the king's ears against him," and obtained a promise that he would never more speak to Wolsey. At an early hour he rode out with Anne, dined at Harewell, and did not return till the evening. The cardinal, who had come according to appointment, received a hint to return to London. Compare Cavendish, 438—444, with the bishop of Bayonne's Letter, 375, and Ellis, 1, 307.

with the amorous temperament of Henry, with his impetuous disposition, with his indelicate allusions and anticipations in his correspondence with her,⁴ and he will not want evidence to teach him in what relation they lived together, nor feel any surprise, if her child was born within little more than seven months after the clandestine celebration of their marriage.

Henry and Mary Boleyn. The reviewer, in the next place, refuses to believe, that Mary Boleyn, the sister of Anne, had ever been the mistress of Henry. His chief reason is, that the story depends primarily on the credit of cardinal Pole, "in an acrimonious invective against the king," and "it

⁴ See his letters, iv. v. vi. ix. xvi. The seventeen letters preserved in the Vatican, have been copied in Hearne's Avesbury, the Harleian Collection, vol. iii. and the Pamphleteer, vol. xxi. xxii. From the circumstance that the 16th was written, while the king was labouring at "his book," we may safely date it in some of the last months of 1527, or at latest in January, 1528. At that time Henry and Anne had come to an understanding; she had consented to faire l'offyce dung vray loyal mestres et amye, et de se donner corps et cuer à luy; and he had promised to make her his wife and queen in the place of Catharine. Hence we must assign the letters, which refer to the first part of their courtship (i. iv. v. viii.) to the year 1527, and its commencement to the year 1526, as in one of them (v.) Henry asserts that more than a year had elapsed since he was wounded by the arrow of love, attaynte du dart d'amours.

In 1528 she was absent from court, from the beginning of June to the middle of August, and again from the beginning of September to the beginning of December, after which she constantly accompanied the king. To the first of these two periods belong the letters iii. vii. xii. xiii., to the latter vi. xiv. xvii. As the others (ii. viii. ix. x. xi. xv.) neither mention the divorce, nor the arrival of Campeggio, I think they must have been written in 1527; and of these the ninth and tenth were sent during the season for buck-hunting, which lasted from the 29th of June to the 13th of September.

is far from improbable that he may have heightened and aggravated some scandalous report into a positive assertion ; more especially as he is known to have watched with a vigilance, not entirely disinterested, the claim of Mary, daughter of Catharine, to the succession.”⁵

1. The work, which is here styled “an acrimonious invective,” is entitled, *pro ecclesiasticæ unitatis defensione libri quatuor*. Henry had repeatedly ordered his kinsman to explain his notions respecting the supremacy ; and Pole, with much hesitation, and after many delays, sent him this treatise in manuscript for his private perusal. It was begun soon after the separation of Henry from the church of Rome, and continued during the time when all Europe resounded with execration of the tyrant, who had put to death Fisher and More : and the writer, attached to the king by the ties of blood and gratitude, persuaded himself that to open his eyes to the turpitude of his conduct, it was necessary to lay it before him without disguise or qualification. Hence he adopted an asperity of language, which, joined to that declamatory style, in which he always indulged, was more calculated to irritate, than to convince. But this, though it may lead us to impeach his prudence, ought not to affect his credit. He would have defeated his own object, had he “aggravated scandalous reports into positive assertions,” or exhorted Henry to repent of offences, which he did not know that the king had committed.”

The notice of the amour with Mary Boleyn is

thus introduced. Pole had asserted that Henry, in seeking to procure a divorce from Catharine, pretended motives of conscience, but was in reality actuated by motives of passion. "How," he proceeds, "you will perhaps ask, can I know what passes in the secret of your own breast? No one but God can know it. I answer that God has shewn it to me, and not to me only, but to every man, who will take the trouble to consider your conduct: he has shewn it through the very person whom you have chosen to fill the place of your lawful wife. For who is she? *The sister of a woman, whom you had long kept as a mistress.* But did you not know that the law, which forbids you to marry the relict of your brother, if he have known her carnally, also forbids you to marry the woman, whose sister you have carnally known yourself? If then you reject one of these marriages through respect for the law, you ought to reject the other for the same reason. And say not that you were ignorant of this part of the law. No one knew it better than yourself. You proved it by soliciting a dispensation to marry the sister of one who had been your concubine. Thus the very choice of the person for your second wife discloses your real motives. She, silent though she be, proclaims to the world that lust, and not religion, induced you to claim the benefit of the law in Leviticus."⁶

⁶ Quî me scire potuisset quo animo id feceris? Quem autem nisi solum *deum* animum tuum nosse? Dico *deum* mihi revelasse, nec vero mihi uni plusquam reliquis omnibus, qui dare operam vulerunt ut causam cognoscerent Deus revelavit, non per se quidem, ut multa persæpe multis, sed per illam ipsam adulteram, quam tu in uxoris cubile induxisti Quid ea, cujusmodi tandem est? An non soror ejus est, quam tu violasti primum, et diu postea concu-

The reader will observe, that in this extract Pole does not undertake to prove the alleged amour of Henry with Mary Boleyn: he takes it for granted: he assumes it as a known and undisputed fact: and from it he argues, that the king knew his intended marriage with Anne to be no less forbidden by the Levitical law, than his past marriage with Catharine. In several other passages he refers with equal confidence to the same amour, and on each occasion his language is that of a man, who asserts nothing of which he is not assured, and who neither fears nor expects to meet with contradiction. The truth is, that, as far as we know, no one had the hardihood to contradict him.

2. But it seems that I “have ingeniously produced a corroboration of Pole’s testimony by an inference drawn from a passage of a most remarkable document, a dispensation granted to Henry at his

binæ loco apud te habuisti? Illa ipsa est. Quomodo ergo nos doces quam refugias ab illicitis matrimoniis? An tu hic *legem ignorabas*, quæ non minus profecto vetat, sororem te ejus ducere, cum qua unum corpus factus sis, quam ejus cum qua frater. Si una detestanda est, altera etiam detestanda. An *hanc legem nesciebas*? At tu *omnium optime noras*. Verum quo pacto hoc scio? Quia eodem tempore ab eodem pontifice magna vi contendebas, ut tibi liceret ducere sororem ejus, quæ concubina tua fuisset, idque impetrasti. An non igitur hæc ipsa, quam nunc habes pro uxore quæ tua mens fuerit, planissime ostendit? An non per ejus personam, ea tacente, Deus omnibus certum facit, te quo libidini tuæ obsequeris, non ut Dei mandato obtemperares, legis mentionem fecisse. Poli pro eccl. unit. defensione, l. iii. p. 53, 54, 55. Argentorati, 1555. I have transcribed this long passage, 1. to shew the scope of Pole’s reasoning; 2. to explain the sense in which he used the word “revelation;” 3. to point out the fact to which the words “*quo pacto hoc scio*,” refer. They refer not to the amour with Mary Boleyn, but to the king’s knowledge of the prohibition in Leviticus.

own request.”⁷ That it is a corroboration, an irrefragable corroboration of Pole’s testimony, no one can doubt. He had alluded to the dispensation, I produced it. Its object was to do away every impediment to Henry’s intended union with Anne, as soon as the marriage with Catharine should be pronounced invalid. It was for this purpose composed by the canonists in England, approved by Henry, and granted by the pontiff. Now, what was obtained by it? A license to marry another woman, 1st, though that woman were under a contract of marriage to a third person, provided it had not been actually consummated; 2d. and though she might stand in the first degree of affinity to the king, arising out of his connexion (lawfully or unlawfully) with some other woman, provided she, whom he meant to marry, were not the relict of his brother.⁸ The first part, it is evident, referred to the precontract of marriage, suspected to have been made between Anne Boleyn and Lord Percy: but to what did the second refer? Manifestly to the king’s amour with Mary Boleyn. In no other case could Anne stand in the first degree of affinity towards him. Thus the dispensation proves beyond the possibility of doubt the truth of Pole’s statement.

3. It is amusing to observe how the reviewer

⁷ Review, 13.

⁸ 1°. Etiam si talis sit quæ prius cum alio contraxerit, dummodo illud carnali copula non fuerit consummatum. 2°. Etiam si illa tibi alias secundo aut remotiore consanguinitatis, aut primo affinitatis gradu, etiam ex quocumque licito aut illicito coitu proveniente, invicem conjuncta sit, dummodo relictæ fratris tui non fuerit. Wilkins, Con. iii. 707.

winds and writhes himself into all postures and shapes, to escape from this difficulty. 1. He assumes a most charitable tone, and will never believe "that the pope, the infallible guardian of christian morals, would sanction the grossest incest by granting such a dispensation." Whether the dispensation can be said to sanction incest, any more than a bill of divorce passed by the legislature, sanctions adultery, I will not determine. That I leave the reviewer to settle with the pontiff. It is sufficient for me that, as an historian, I did my duty by relating the fact. 2. He is, moreover, sure that Henry would never have asked for it. "If the incestuous connexion were a secret from the world, would he not have thrown the proof of it upon others, rather than have thus proclaimed it? If it had been so public and notorious as to make concealment unnecessary, must not some other evidence besides Pole's have remained?"⁹ It were easy to break either horn of this dilemma. But I shall answer, that whether the connexion were public or secret, a dispensation became requisite: otherwise the validity of the marriage, and in consequence the legitimacy of the children by that marriage, might afterwards be disputed. 3. He maintains "as a

⁹ Review, 14. I may add from one of Henry's letters to Anne, that he retained a kindness for Mary, after he had abandoned her. Her father and mother had refused to receive her into their house; and Henry by his private secretary, Walter Welch, wrote to lord Rochford in her favour. "Tochyng your sister mater, I have causyd water welze to wrtte to my lorde myne mynde hercin: whereby I truste that eve shall not have poure to dessayve adam: for surly, what soever is sayde, it cannot stand wt hys honour, but that he must neds take her hys natural dawgther now in her extreme necesse." Pamphleteer, xxii. 118.

safe inference," that Pole had no other ground than this dispensation for his scandalous assertion:" and yet a few lines before he had told us that very probably Pole had taken it up from report, and heightened and aggravated that report into a positive assertion. 4th. He begins to disbelieve the document altogether, and wonders "that Dr. Lingard should rest on such partial, questionable, and suspicious evidence," and yet almost in the same breath, he had admitted the instrument as genuine, when he so "safely" pronounced it the real foundation of Pole's statement.

Speeches of Anne Boleyn. Having informed us that "the tender mercies of some are cruelty, and the charity of others is not much better," the reviewer proceeds to complain of the injustice done to Anne Boleyn by the unfair inferences which have been drawn from her speeches in the Tower. Though my name is introduced into this paragraph, I can hardly persuade myself that I am the person censured. I have related those speeches, it is true: but I have related them impartially, giving those which make for the queen, as well as those which make against her. I then proceed thus: "From them it is, indeed, plain that her conduct had been imprudent: that she had descended from her high station to make companions of her men servants; and that she had been so weak as to listen to their declarations of love. But whether she rested here, or abandoned herself to the impulse of licentious desire, is a question which probably never can be determined."¹⁰ This is the inference which I drew,

¹⁰ Hist. vi. 316.

and I wish to know what reasonable objection can be raised against it. The reviewer, indeed, complains that by the words men-servants, the general reader may understand men in the lowest rank of life, while in reality three out of the four were gentlemen by birth. Had he looked into pages 313 and 323, he would have found this remark unnecessary. I have twice made the distinction, which he complains that I have suppressed.

Allen's admonition. He afterwards introduces, with a sneer, what he terms "a remarkable instance of Dr. Lingard's impartiality." It refers to a tract entitled, "An admonition to the nobility and people of England and Ireland, concerninge the present warres made for the execution of his holines sentence by the highe and mightie kinge Catholicke of Spain, by the cardinal of Englande. Anno MDLXXXVIII." The reviewer's words are "Dr. Lingard analyzes the tract as far as the abuse of the queen, which, however extravagant, may influence the reader in the estimate of her character. But the fourth part he passes lightly over, and the treasonable division, which would display his own party in the darkest and truest colours, and fully confirms their designs against the queen's life, and the nation's independence, he omits entirely with a reference to Fuller and Mr. Butler."

Had I been the partial and interested writer, whom the reviewer is pleased to represent me, instead of analyzing any part of this tract, I should have allowed it to remain in the obscurity in which it lay concealed. Nothing called on me to detail its contents. But the book has always been extremely scarce: though I can enumerate twenty writers who have mentioned it, I do not believe that any

one of them had seen it: and on that account I thought I should gratify the curiosity of my readers by giving an analysis of it in my notes. But then I had but little space: the volume had already reached the six hundredth and sixtieth page, a bulk which I had not anticipated; and for that reason I confined my description to the part of the book, which was unknown, and for the remainder referred the reader to the accounts already published. This is the partiality of which I have been guilty.

But may I ask what is the meaning of the passage, "which would display his own party in the darkest and truest colours?" Why am I to be identified with the Spanish party? Where have I approved of their intrigues or designs? The Spanish party composed not the great body of English catholics. The former projected and promoted the Spanish expedition; the latter rose to oppose it with an energy and unanimity, which extorted from their very adversaries the praise of loyalty and patriotism.

Perhaps I ought, in conclusion, to apologize to the reader for the length to which these pages have run. He must attribute it to the numerous charges and cavils of my adversaries. If I have endeavoured to vindicate myself, I have also been careful to avoid all irrelevant matter and unnecessary prolixity. On most of the subjects, I might with justice have said more: on none, with a due regard to my own character, could I have said less.

THE END.



